A SECOND

# TREATISE

ON

# CHURCH-GOVERNMENT,

In Three PARTS:

BEING,

I. A Continuation of the NARRATIVE of the late Troubles and Tranſactions in the CHURCH in *Bolton*: With ſome Remarks on Mr. *Goſs*'s NARRATIVE.

II. A REPLY to Mr. *Adams*'s Anſwer to my former Treatiſe: In which is ſhewn the abſurdity of his Notion that COUNCILS are more likely to do juſtice than the PEOPLE; as alſo of his Notion that *Judgment* and *Advice* both mean the ſame thing; as alſo of his Notion of the negative Power.

III. Shewing from the WORD of GOD the ſole Right People have to call and diſmiſs their Officers. And ſhewing, that for Miniſters to be Moderators of Church-Meetings and Negativers, is abſurd and incompatible.

With an APPENDIX, being ſome Remarks on a Pamphlet ſaid to be offered to the CHURCHES by the CONVENTION of MINISTERS.

To which is added,—The TESTIMONIES of many Perſons in *Bolton*, to certain FACTS in Anſwer or Contradiction to Mr. *Goſs*'s NARRATIVE.

---

By a *NEIGHBOUR.*

---

*And on the morrow when he departed, he took out two pence, and gave them to the hoſt, and ſaid unto him, Take care of him; and whatſoever thou ſpendeſt more, when I come again I will repay thee.* LUKE X. 35.

*When thou doſt alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doth.* MAT. VI. 3.

---

BOSTON:
Printed by JOHN BOYLE, in Marlborough-Street.
MDCCLXXIII.

BRITISH MUSEUM

# A SECOND TREATISE ON CHURCH-GOVERNMENT.

## PART I.

ON my return, finding that conſiderable charge had aroſe ſince my leaving my patient with the hoſt; which require ſome further diſburſtments; I ſhall now according to my ability and opportunity, act a neighbourly part for the healing of my patient; which has become the more neceſſary ſince Mr. *Adams* and Mr. *Goſs*, by way of anſwer to my former Treatiſe, have endeavoured to tear open the wounds I had bound up. And as I am on my journey, and in haſte, if there ſhould be ſome incorrectneſs, I hope the public will be as readily diſpoſed to forgive it, as to forgive Mr. *Adams*'s *accrimony*.

In this Treatiſe, I ſhall firſt continue ſome brief account of the affairs of *Bolton*.

The reader may remember that at the cloſe of my former Narrative, I obſerved that the neighbouring miniſters had endeavoured to prevent *Bolton* people from having the goſpel preached to them, or enjoying goſpel privileges abroad. It had been reported that they had entered into a written combination for that purpoſe. Some few ſingle perſons having heard of ſuch a writing, the church choſe a committee to apply for a copy of it; who have ſought in vain for a copy; and have not to this day obtained one. After repeated ſollicitations, to a certain gentleman for a copy, one of the committee received the following letter from ſaid gentleman, viz.

" ———— *April* 7, 1773.

Capt. *Bailey*,

I believe you can't but remember, that when you have heretofore aſked me to give you a copy of what a number of miniſters who belonging to our aſſociation drew up to manifeſt our uneaſineſs at *Bolton* proceedings, I then told you that I did not know how I could do it, for the papers which were with me, were only the rough minutes of what was then done, and thus I have certified you ſince—but when you was here laſt, and did ſtill deſire it, I tho't I would write out what I had—and intimated to you that I would ſee what I could do to gratify you in your requeſt. But though I have accordingly gone about it, and did what I then could in compliance with what I ſaid to you, yet I find that what was drawn from thoſe rough original minutes and delivered to Mr. *Goſs* was different, and I could not ſay mine was a true copy. And as to the *ſigning* of it, I cannot certify it was ſigned by the aſſociation, *as ſuch*, but as *miniſters of Chriſt*, affectionately concerned for the proſperity of Chriſt's kingdom, and in particular out of compaſſion to precious ſouls in that place. Some of thoſe who ſigned, I ſuppoſe can recollect, but I find not their names left with me, nor had I thoſe beſides, who,

when they ſaw it, ſubſcribed it : I underſt and there has been a number of them.

Thus have I in a meek manner related to you how this matter has been with me; and that you ought not to have expected what was not in my power to grant. I don't know that there was any exact copy of that which Mr. *Goſs* had. Let me know what you can deſire further —being willing to fulfil every reaſonable engagement.

*I am your's affectionately,*

——— ———."

The ſuperſcription to the above letter was—" To Capt. *Silas Bailey* in *Bolton*, THESE,"

There are many things very remarkable in the above letter. The reaſon of their applying more eſpecially to the gentleman that wrote the above, was becauſe it was ſaid he was ſcribe of the aſſociation, when the paper they were in queſt of was drawn up.

Now he ſays, he " can't certify that it was ſigned by the aſſociation, *as ſuch*." What then ? he owns in the letter that he had the original minutes of the tranſactions reſpecting the paper they were after ; and I underſtand that he has owned verbally before two ſubſtantial gentlemen, that he gave and atteſted what Mr. *Goſs* had ; and yet now he profeſſes not to know that there was another paper upon earth like that which Mr. *Goſs* had. Strange ! that *a number of miniſters* ſhould *draw up* ſomething, and give off one authentic copy, ſo powerful, as not only to ſhut *Bolton* people out of communion with all the churches upon earth, but alſo to ſhut all preaching out from them ; and yet it was drawn up ſo *rough*, that there never could be another copy. This repreſents, as though all thoſe miniſters were idiots or mad-men ; at leaſt had a fit of frenzy or diſtraction upon them. But it is plain by the letter, that the author of it, had acceſs to that which

Mr. *Goſs* had ; for he ſays, he finds that what he had drawn from his rough minutes, *was different from that which Mr.* Goſs *had* : Why then could he not correct his by Mr. *Goſs*'s, and let Capt. *Bailey* have it, ſince he was ſo willing to gratify the Captain, and had ſo fair an opportunity for it ?

But what is above all things unaccountable is, that, " *miniſters of Chriſt*, affectionately concerned for the proſperity of Chriſt's kingdom, and in particular out of compaſſion to precious ſouls in that place," ſhould draw up and ſign ſomething, out of ſuch *compaſſion* for thoſe *precious ſouls*, and never let thoſe *precious ſouls* have it ! Yea and when the very *ſouls* they had ſuch compaſſion for, have for above a year been diligently ſeeking for and requeſting it. The only way I can ſee, that we can account for this, ſo as to exculpate this gentleman from falacy, in ſaying the miniſters drew up ſaid paper, *out of compaſſion to precious ſouls in that place*, is to ſuppoſe, that they drew up the *rough* materials, and the finiſhed piece ſome how got into Mr. *Goſs*'s hands, and that he is no miniſter of Chriſt, nor has any compaſſion for precious ſouls in *Bolton*.

Be ſaid paper what it would, or drawn up out of whatever ſpirit, whether *compaſſion to precious ſouls in that place*, or a contrary ſpirit ; yet it is evident, that it has operated, by the inſtrumentality of the miniſters, ſo as that it has been with conſiderable difficulty, that *Bolton* people have obtained the preaching of the word to them ; for every one who goes there, even if it be no more than to preach the word to thoſe *precious ſouls*, is conſidered as very offenſive to the neighbouring gentlemen in the miniſtry.

However, they have found ſome who have fortitude enough to go and preach to them ; and in *April*, 1773, gave the Rev'd Mr. *Walley* a call to ſettle in the miniſtry among them ; who ſome time in the month of *May* fol-

lowing gave his anſwer to tarry with them. And in the month of *June* following they had a council in order to have inſtalled the Rev'd Mr. *Walley*. But the council, as they ſay in their reſult, finding diſſentions among the people, and ſome hopes of an accommodation, adjourned to the firſt Tueſday in *Auguſt* following.

By the way I underſtand, that the council ſpent much time and pains to endeavor that there might be a reconciliation; and that it was propoſed and engaged, on the part of the town, that if Mr. *Goſs* would put an end to all his demands upon the town, his adherents ſhould draw out of the treaſury all their proportion of money, raiſed for the ſupport of the goſpel to that day. What notice or return Mr. *Goſs* and his adherents made to this I cannot ſay; however, to be ſure they did not take up with the offer; if they had, poſſibly there would have been an end of the diviſion. I underſtand that Mr. *Goſs*'s adherents, profeſs that they are ſo far out of charity with the others, that they could not hold communion with them; even if it were in a ſiſter church, where they might chance occaſionally to meet. The others ſay, they are not ſo out of charity with them; that they are with open arms ready to receive them; and I underſtand that when the council urged them to come together, it was anſwered on the part of the town, that they had nothing to do; for they had offered their brethren their proportion of the money raiſed for the ſupport of the goſpel, and ſtood with open arms to receive them; but the difficulty lay on the other ſide, they would neither accept nor come.

I underſtand that in the receſs of the council, they had an opportunity for attending ſpecial ordinances; at which were about ſixty communicants, and thirty-five children baptized.

*Auguſt* 3d, 1773. The council met according to adjournment: And there was alſo a number of gentlemen

at Mr. *Goſs*'s, who were ſaid to be a council convened at his deſire ; yet neither the church nor their council could ever obtain any certificate thereof, by copy, or by hearing their letter miſſive, although that was an objection made againſt them, that the church or council had no regular notice of their coming, what they came for, or how they were invited : Which gives very good reaſon to ſuppoſe they had no regular invitation at all.

However they, with the help of two or three of the churches council, who were abundantly with them, brought to paſs the deſired effect for Mr. *Goſs*, ſo far as to eat up the time, and to bewilder ſome of the council, ſo as that a vote was not obtained for the *inſtallment*. It was obſerved, that certain in the council, were ſo buſy with Mr. *Goſs*, and thoſe convened with him, and alſo in open council, ſo vehemently ſet againſt the cauſe of the people, that nothing could be done.

Accordingly on the 6th of ſaid *Auguſt*, the council diſſolved, I ſuppoſe to the abundant ſatisfaction of many of the people. And I conclude they will ſend out for a new council, in which there will be none that will endeavor to bewilder, and turn aſide thoſe that are friends to liberty and the conſtitution. By the way I underſtand it was propoſed on the part of the town, to Mr. *Goſs* and his adherents, that upon condition Mr. *Goſs* would put an end to all his demands upon the town, they, viz. his adherents, ſhould draw out of the treaſury £. 70 lawful money, (which was more than Mr. *Goſs*'s ſalary to that time) and they to hear Mr. *Walley* three or four ſabbaths, and then give their conſent to the acts of the church and town, reſpecting Mr. *Walley*'s call, or make no farther uneaſineſs ; and if any of them could not comfortably commune at home, they might in any ſiſter church, and no offence thereby be taken by their brethren at home ; and if they choſe to ſet up public worſhip by themſelves

hereafter, they ſhould be exempted from miniſterial taxes to the town.

By which it appears, that on the part of the town, every thing was done that could be. They offered their brethren and neighbours more than their proportion of money to that time, and then either to unite or keep by themſelves for the future, in ſhort to do juſt as they pleaſed; and yet this would not do, it was not accepted by Mr. *Goſs* or his adherents. Neither did it effect any thing to conciliate the minds of thoſe in council, who at the motion of it, ſeemed as if that would wholly ſatisfy them.

I ſhall now make ſome remarks on Mr. *Goſs's Narrative*. As to matters of fact that he has denyed, which were offered in my former Treatiſe, or any that he has advanced as his own, I ſhall leave that to the people, who I doubt not are able to vindicate themſelves to the public, as to their conduct.

But there are ſome things ſo abſurd and contradictory in Mr. *Goſs*'s Narrative, that they highly demand ſome notice from me, ſince he has undertook to animadvert ſo largely upon the Narrative I had given. I ſhall juſt hint to the public, wherein it appears to me he has not cleared himſelf of groſs blame, even by his own ſtory. In page 7th, the very firſt quotation he pretends to make from my Narrative, he has tranſcribed it eſſentially *falſe*, leaving out ſome material words upon which the ſtreſs of the account depends. I had in my 4th page ſaid, "that the church voted to accept of his declaration for a ſettlement of the affair, UPON CONDITION he would read it off publickly to the congregation the next Lord's day, and lodge a copy OF IT with the oldeſt deacon."

The words which I have here put in capitals, Mr. *Goſs* in his pretended quotation, has omitted. That theſe were

moſt material words in the account, will be ſeen in my next remark, and alſo what Mr. *Goſs* omitted them for, may be eaſily gueſſed.

Page 8, in pretending to exculpate himſelf on account of the falſe copy left with the deacon, he does not pretend to deny but that it was a falſe one, and he knew it when he left it with the deacon ; but has ſaid much to prove that he did know it was a falſe one. The plain Engliſh of it is, that he knew he was impoſing upon the church, and violating his own ſolemn promiſe ; for the ſettlement was UPON CONDITION *he would read it off publickly to the congregation the next Lord's day, and lodge a copy OF IT with the oldeſt deacon.* As to the firſt part of the *condition*, I muſt leave the people to ſay whether he ever fulfilled that. As to the laſt part of the *condition*, it is plain by Mr. *Goſs*'s own ſtory, that he never has fulfilled that ; for he don't pretend that he lodged a copy OF IT *with the oldeſt deacon.* But he ſays, it is well known to Col. *Whetcomb*, and every other complainant, that he neither wrote nor atteſted that copy ; but that it was the Rev'd Mr. *Harrington* who did both.

What does Mr. *Goſs* mean by this ! Was Mr. *Harrington* his *God-father*, or *ſponſor ?* Does he mean to make the world believe that the church were to look to Mr. *Harrington* for ſatisfaction for Mr. *Goſs*'s faults ? Well, but might not Mr. *Harrington* do Mr. *Goſs* the favour, to copy off any thing for Mr. *Goſs*, that he deſired him to ? No doubt and he might, if he pleaſed atteſt too, that he had copied it off for Mr. *Goſs*. But when he had done, Mr. *Goſs* knew it was not the thing that he was to lodge with the deacon ; and yet he goes and leaves it with the deacon, as the fulfilment of his engagement and promiſe. Does not Mr. *Goſs* know that it is as bad to utter or put off falſe money, *knowing* it to be ſuch, as to make it ; nay that the putting it off is the principal part of the crime ; and yet

here Mr. *Goſs* went and put off a falſe bill, and has taken pains to prove to the world that he knew it was falſe when he put it off. And his plea for innocency in the affair, is, that he did not make it himſelf, and that he told, or gave to underſtand, that he *knew* it was *falſe* when he put it off !

And yet ſo many venerable councils have been there to conſider of theſe things, and have found little or no blame in Mr. *Goſs*, and every time exhorted the people to be at peace with him ! page 13.

WHAT ! is it not as bad, knowingly and willingly to utter and put off corrupt falſe things in ſacred affairs, as in civil ? Is this no crime, or nothing blame-worthy ? which in civil affairs, in the mildeſt civil governments, is whipping, cropping, branding, pillory, imprisonment and confiſcation ; and yet the like in ſacred things, is judged by ſeveral councils to be little or nothing blame-worthy. I hope it will never be pretended, that there were any miniſters of Chriſt, or miniſters of civil juſtice in any of theſe councils. Mr. *Goſs* ſays they were his *peers*, I ſuppoſe he means *equals*. I am very ſory there can be found ſo many, ſo much his *equals* in this land, as to connive at, or judge ſuch things harmleſs.

I truſt it appears plain to every one, from Mr. *Goſs*'s own Narrative which he has publiſhed, that he never has ſettled with the church for their firſt complaint ; having never fulfilled the CONDITIONS of the ſettlement ; but has made it many degrees worſe ; and that he treats not only his own people, but the public with ſhuffling, falacy and deceit.

In the 9th page Mr. *Goſs* quotes a paſſage out of the 5th page of my Narrative, in theſe words, " That (with reſpect to certain brethren of whom he complained) he was aſked whether he had taken the previous chriſtian ſteps with them ? that he ſaid he had ; that he was then aſked,

why he had not brought it forward before ? And that he anſwered, becauſe he knew not of them till to-day, and chiefly this afternoon."

In anſwer to this, Mr. *Goſs* ſays, " There needs nothing more to be be ſaid—than what my accuſers owned before the council, viz. That at the ſame meeting in which I am accuſed of this, I declared, that as to the thing they would have theſe words affixed to, I neither had,nor could have taken any ſuch ſteps, as I had but that day heard of it ;—on which the council acquitted me of blame."

And truly, *there needs nothing more to be ſaid*, to prove Mr. *Goſs* guilty of falſehood, and the council of juſtifying of him in it. For it is plain the ſtreſs of the complaint or blame in that paſſage, he quoted out of my Narrative, was, that he ſhould ſay *he had taken the previous chriſtian ſteps*, when he had not, it appearing by his own words, it was impoſſible he ſhould ; and now Mr.*Goſs* has brought the ſame evidence with ſome addition, which proves that it was falſe for him to ſay, *he had taken the previous ſteps with them brethren.*

In the ſame, viz. the 9th page, Mr. *Goſs* mentions another paſſage from my Narrative, where I ſpake of his *ſhewing a paper to a council which he had promiſed he would not* ; now Mr. *Goſs* owns he promiſed ſo ; but he ſays *there was nothing to prove he had ſhewn it.* But the very beginning of the next, viz. 10th page, he plainly owns he had *ſhewn it.* For repeating my words " that ſaid paper AS SHEWN was erroneous" he anſwers, " IT is the ſame which the church owned to be true," now if there be any meaning at all in words, the word IT has reference to *ſaid paper as ſhewn*, ſo that Mr. *Goſs*'s words in this place ſtand as if he had ſaid " that *ſaid paper as ſhewn was the ſame which the church owned to be true.* And it is plain, he means it ſhould be taken in that ſenſe ; for nothing is more manifeſt, than, that what he is after in this place,

is to wipe off the charge of the *paper ſhewn being erroneous.* But if there was no paper ſhewn, there could be no ſuch thing as error, truth or *fameneſs* in the caſe.

Thus we have Mr. *Goſs* within the compaſs of ſix or ſeven lines, both denying and owning the ſame thing.

In the 14th page Mr. *Goſs* has a very remarkable paſſage, where after having given an account of their having two days and an half of church meetings, all upon the ſame affairs, and each day the meeting held until dark, he ſays, " During this time we had not ſettled one article, but had really, in the courſe of the meeting, increaſed the number. It may be obſerved here, that once, or oftener, two articles were comprehended in one vote. But finally, both thinking and ſaying, that all matters for which the meeting was called, were paſſed upon," &c. A moſt unaccountable ſet of words, that ever were put together! *Two articles comprehended in one vote; and yet not one article* ſettled! *Not one article ſettled; and yet all matters for which the meeting was called were paſſed upon!* Pray were not the matters for which the meeting was called, to ſettle thoſe articles? And behold all matters finiſhed and not one ſettled!!! Upon which he diſſolved the meeting, and as I underſtand has had no church meeting ſince; unleſs he thinks he can have church meetings when he knows he has none, as well as all matters ſettled, when not one is ſettled. This is indeed according to what he holds forth in another place, where he would fain make the world believe that the major part of the church are not againſt him; when he knows there are twenty-eight againſt him, and upon trial very lately he could not *raiſe* above twenty for him. For to me it would be as eaſy to think, nothing to be ſomething, as to think twenty to be more than twenty-eight.

I cannot cloſe up my remarks on Mr. *Goſs*'s defence in his Narrative, without obſerving, that he has not (as I

ſaid) ſaid any thing to invalidate what Col. *Whetcomb* has offered in the appendix to my former Treatiſe; in which the Col. has aſſerted, that Mr. *Goſs* repeatedly declared that *he had never drank to that degree, ſo as in any way to affect or hurt his reaſon, ſpeech or limbs.* And in his written declaration to the church, on account of ſuppoſed intemperance, Mr. *Goſs* ſays, *I do not pretend there is no foundation of ſuſpicion; but rather think it was mainly owing to ſome other cauſe or cauſes.* And declared *that he could not, nor would not, make any further confeſſion, and that he ſhould do violence to his own conſcience if he did, till at length—he acknowledges, that conſcious of his own faultineſs, he freely and frankly confeſſes his ſin and faults, in the exceſſive uſe of ſpirituous liquors in ſeveral inſtances;—and always inſiſted upon it, that his written declaration was equal to this confeſſion.*

The above is too manifeſtly pregnant with abſurdity, contradiction and repugnancy, to admit any thing ſaid to prove it. And Mr. *Goſs*'s pretenſions that the firſt was equal to the laſt, is too groſs an affront to common ſenſe, to ſuppoſe the weakeſt capacity not inſtantly to diſcern it. I ſuppoſe that when any thing is publiſhed, and an anſwer to it publiſhed alſo, what is not denyed, is allowed to be true.

So then, here we have it, either aſſerted or allowed by Mr. *Goſs*.

1. That he knowingly and wilfully uttered and put off a baſe falſe bill to anſwer his promiſe to the church, and therefore never ſettled with them for their firſt complaint: but made it verily worſe.

2. That he ſpake falſe, in ſaying he had taken chriſtian ſteps with certain brethren.

3. That he violated his promiſe, in ſhewing a certain paper contrary to it.

4. That he has ſtrangely contradicted himſelf in his 14th

page: Repreſenting as though nothing was done, and every thing done at the ſame time.

5. That all the duplicity, and repugnancy of conduct and pretenſions, and the affront to common ſenſe charged upon him by Col. *Whetcomb* in the appendix, is true.

Mr. *Goſs* in his 16th page ſays, "And now, who but a Samaritan indeed, and his informer, could have repreſented things in ſo partial and unfair a light." Whoever looks over his ſtory, and conſiders the abſurdity of it, and the ſelf-contradictorineſs of his conduct, may no doubt be ready to ſay, *Who but a prieſt indeed*, and one endued with the ſame ſpirit of the prieſts of old, who contrived the ſelf-contradictory falſehood, about our Saviour's reſurrection; who, but one filled with the ſame ſpirit and infatuation, could put ſo many abſurdities and repugnancies together, and expect to have them received.

## PART II.

I Come now to make ſome particular REPLY to Mr. *Adams*. I ſhall not hinder myſelf, or the public, with noticing every thing in his piece that might well deſerve remark. I ſhall only make ſome brief remarks upon ſome things, and proceed to the main points, to apply ſome detergents to remove the *acrimony* || which Mr. *Adams* haſt caſt into the wound.

---

|| Mr. *Adams* in his 5th page, mentions that we may expect *acrimony* in his piece; a word chiefly and almoſt ſolely uſed in the practice of phyſic and ſurgery: meaning that quality in medicines or the humours of the body, whereby they corrode, i.e. gnaw or fret the ſolids; therefore require *detergent* and *emollient* remedies, which by their ſoftening adheſive and ſheathing quality, with a certain or peculiar activity, may carry off the *acrimony*, and aſſiſt nature to heal the diſeaſed part.

First I take notice Mr. *Adams* in his title page has theſe words "Thou art a SAMARITAN, *John* VIII. 48." Words ſpoken by Mr. *Adams* no doubt with the ſame ſpirit, that they were originally in the place from which he quoted them. The reader by turning to the chapter will find the occaſion of theſe words, by whom they were ſpoken, and to whom they were directed.

Mr. *Henry* upon this paſſage, begins thus "Here is 1. The malice of hell breaking out in the baſe language which the unbelieving Jews gave to our Lord Jeſus;—now at length they fall to downright railing—they were not the common people, but, as it ſhould ſeem, the ſcribes and phariſees, the topping men."—At his concluſion upon this paſſage, he ſays, "Perhaps becauſe Chriſt juſtly inveighed againſt the pride and tyranny of the prieſts and elders, they hereby ſuggeſt that he aimed at the ruin of their church, in aiming at his reformation, and was falling away to the Samaritans."

The reader no doubt by this time ſees, that conſidering who ſpake theſe words at firſt, and the temper and deſign of them, there could not have been words found, with all their circumſtances, more apt for Mr. *Adams* to ſpeak, and to adopt as his *motto*.

The other text he has in his title page, viz. "Every one that doth evil hateth the light," &c. *John* III. 20," will be found very fit and applicable, when conſidered with reference to the *clergy*, *for whoſe benefit* he profeſſedly wrote; eſpecially thoſe who ſigned papers againſt *Bolton* people, and would by no means let them have a copy; keeping what they had done, thus concealed (as we muſt ſuppoſe) *leſt their DEEDS ſhould be reproved:* For it is plain by the text, that it is the DEEDS that are kept in the dark for fear of reproof.

HAVING thus took a view of Mr. *Adams*'s *threſhold*, I paſs to the inſide of the work. There we find a great clamour about my not affixing my name to my *Treatiſe*.

But if Mr. *Adams* had learned what that means which I have in my title page from *Mat.* VI. 3, he might have ſaved himſelf the trouble of all he has ſaid upon my not affixing my name. Mr. *Henry* upon this place ſays, " The right hand may be uſed in helping the poor, lifting them up, writing for them, dreſſing their ſores, &c. But whatever kindneſs thy right-hand doth to the poor, *let not thy left-hand know it*, i. e. conceal it as much as poſſible, induſtriouſly keep it private," &c.

Not that I ſuppoſe *Bolton*, or the man that fell among thieves, were objects of charity, or would have needed alms, had they not unfortunately been ſtripped and wounded. It may alſo be obſerved, that in the parable, neither the prieſt, the levite, nor the thieves are named, any more than the *Samaritan*; and it might from me have been ſo here, if Mr. *Adams* had been content.

I would alſo juſt further obſerve, that all Mr. *Adams*'s invectives againſt my Treatiſe for want of a name, equally lie againſt many of the ſacred books, and particularly the epiſtle to the *Hebrews*.

I come now to ſpeak ſomething particular, as to what he ſays in anſwer to the remarks on the ſermon.

He takes great offence at what I ſaid about minor parties ſetting up in oppoſition to the body, and has made two obſervations upon it, one confounding the other, as it appears to me, but I have not time to animadvert upon that, only I muſt obſerve this, that *Luther* and our *Fore-Fathers* he ſpeaks of, did not ſeparate; they teſtified againſt what they thought was bad, and ſo it went on from ſtep to ſtep, till they were drove out. And ſo ſays Mr. *Adams*, Mr. *Goſs*'s *adherents were violently diſpoſſeſſed of the houſe they uſed to congregate in*, page 30. But this is a ſlander upon the town, for which Mr. *Adams* deſerves proſecution, according to his own words; for where any one charges that upon another, which if true, would ſubject that other

to any penalty, action lies; and this is according to God's word, *Deut.* XIX. 19. *Then ſhalt thou do unto him, as he thought to have done unto his brother*; compare with the 16th verſe: And Mr. *Adams* intimates that the town are worthy of proſecution for diſpoſſeſſing them: But I preſume the town never did keep one perſon out of the meeting-houſe, not even Mr. *Goſs* himſelf.

But I muſt obſerve, that Mr. *Adams*'s notion that *reformation* and *ſeparation* muſt neceſſarily go together, as he appears to hold forth in this place, is a falſe notion. It is indeed exactly the notion of the *ſeparates* which have been in many places for about thirty years paſt; and behold Mr. *Adams*, in writing a piece for the *benefit* of the *clergy*, is become a ſtrenuous advocate for the *ſeparates*.

But I know not of any account of a reformation being brought about by ſeparation, or of good men taking that method: But by ſtanding in their lot, and endeavoring to convince and reclaim thoſe they ſtand in ſocial connection with. And this is according to ſcripture, platform and reaſon.

In the 32d page Mr. *Adams* takes great offence at my ſaying, *that what conſtitutes intereſted perſons in any cauſe, is their winning or looſing ſomething in their perſons or property, by the iſſue of the cauſe.*

This he ſays muſt mean "unleſs he wins or looſes money by the event of the cauſe---or elſe it is ſaying nothing," &c. So that according to him, *money* is both *perſon* and *property*; i.e. in a word, money is every thing. And indeed this is according to the general tenor of his book; for though out of that he makes money, or in other words, the miniſters ſalary, every thing, that muſt be taken care of and ſafe; let conſcience, duty, Chriſt's ordinances, and whatever, go where they can.

However, after he has ſaid many things upon it like *himſelf*, in the 33d page ſays, "This idea is the moſt

contemptible one that ever entered the head of any man :" And yet as above hinted this *contemptible idea entered* Mr. *Adams*'s head with ſuch force, that he has laid it as his corner ſtone to many, if not moſt of his arguments.

Omiting ſundry inſtances of his adopting the *contemptible idea*, turn to the 44th page : There he comes to enquire whether elders have an eſtate in their office ; that this queſtion is of great importance. The miniſter's ALL depends upon this. And through the whole of the next page, there is ſcarce four lines together, but the *contemptible idea* has a place telling about ſtipends, ſalaries, ſupport, pittance, forty or fifty pounds, eſtate in their office, ſettlements given to young miniſters, &c. All to ſhew what a ſpecial and principle force money, worldly profit or eſtate, muſt have in the conſideration of ſettling or diſmiſſing a miniſter, and his relation toward them. It is plain to ſee that he has fixed the foundation of all he ſays upon that *ſuppoſition* which he calls the *moſt contemptible idea*, and the ſame is very abundant in the next page : I need not particularly point out all the places where he has adopted the *contemptible idea*, the reader will eaſily diſcern them as he reads Mr. *Adams*, without my pointing them out. But here to invalidate what I have hinted, of his uſing the *contemptible idea* about the elders eſtate in his office, &c. perhaps Mr. *Adams* will ſay, that it is not ſo *contemptible* an *idea* to SUPPOSE that a miniſter will be altogether influenced in his ſettling by the money or worldly profit he is to receive ; as to *ſuppoſe* the people in diſmiſſing, are influenced by the conſideration of the money they ſhall looſe, and the trouble it will coſt them.

I fear there is too much truth in ſuch an objection ; that too many miniſters, make their worldly profit and honor almoſt or quite the whole conſideration in ſettling.

But as to the people, I never ſuggeſted that money was the only thing in conſideration with them, as Mr. *Adams*

pretends ; or that no man can be induced to do a bad action, &c. unleſs through the influence of money, as he pretends, page 66th. But directly the reverſe, viz. That the coſt and trouble it expoſed a people to, was a very great ballance and guard againſt their judging or acting raſhly, or by prejudice, in diſmiſſing a miniſter, nor has Mr. *Adams* in all his elaborate Treatiſe offered one word to ſhew ſo great a ballance in any other ſet of men ; or indeed any ballance at all.

He pretends indeed, that councils are not ſo likely to be prejudiced, as the people : But this muſt all be upon his old notion, that they are a different order of beings. For if they are mankind ; why are they not as liable to prejudice as the people ? O ſays Mr. *Adams*, the reaſon is plain ; people get prejudiced againſt their miniſter becauſe he is faithful with them ; becauſe he tells them the truth, &c. But does Mr. *Adams* ſuppoſe, that a miniſter never has occaſion to reprove his brethren in the miniſtry, and diſpleaſe them by his faithfulneſs with them ? I fear there is too little of that faithfulneſs among them. However ſuppoſe any one ſhould be faithful toward his brethren in the miniſtry : Are not they as likely to be diſpleaſed with him for it, as his own people ? Surely Mr. *Adams* muſt anſwer yes, and more likely than his own people, unleſs he has reſort to the old notion that miniſters are not mankind. But this he diſowns in his preſent Treatiſe. Therefore the anſwer muſt be, that miniſters are more likely to be offended with, and prejudiced againſt a miniſter, for reproving them than his own people : For the people covenant with him to be their watchman, and they know it is his duty ; and a ſenſe of this has a tendency to keep them in awe, and to reſtrain them from riſing up againſt him in prejudice and revenge ; and then it is to be hoped that in all congregations, there are ſome who will like the miniſter the better for his faithfulneſs ; and will be a

ballance againſt thoſe who conceive a prejudice: But when he comes to reprove a brother in the miniſtry, them that are moſt likely to need reproof, they are likely to be up at once, *who made thee a watchman over me?* or if it be not juſt in them words, the ſpirit likely riſe and offence be taken, under the notion that he has no right to reprove them; nay if a miniſter is not ſo bold as to reprove them, yet if he hold to ſome opinions in faith or practice as different from them, which they imagine would be derogatory to their honor, power or pleaſure, if they ſhould prevail; then a violent luſt of revenge will riſe againſt ſuch a miniſter; and having no *worldly intereſt* to come in competition with their *luſt* of revenge; as Mr. *Adams* in his 33d page allows the people have: I ſay the miniſters having no *worldly profit* or *intereſt*, ſtanding in the way of their luſt; but rather no doubt, imagining that it will ſerve their power, honor or pleaſure, if they can find any diſaffected ones among the people of ſuch miniſter, they will blow up their prejudice, and encourage them to pick a quarrel with their miniſter, and then they muſt ſend for a council; and the diſaffected party know where to ſend; the council comes, and if there can be raiſed a party any thing like, they will adviſe to his diſmiſſion, and then behold he is *judged by his peers!* and then if there is ſcarcely half againſt him with all this buſtle, yet he muſt go, the people muſt diſmiſs him; for according to Mr. *Adams*, he is no miniſter *in foro eccleſiæ*, having a judgment of council againſt him, the church muſt execute the judgment. For the church he conſiders as the ſheriff, calling the church the *executioners*, page 47, and indeed wherever he ſpeaks of the power of the church, eſpecially in the diſmiſſion of a miniſter, it is a power to execute the judgment of a council, where a council can be had: And where they have had the *judgment* or *advice* of a council, it is at their peril if they don't execute it; for

in his 63d and 64th pages, he has it over and over, that if a church has had the *advice* of a council, and do not follow it, ſhe is out of communion or fellowſhip with her ſiſter churches ; or in other words, her ſiſter churches are out of charity with her. And thus the good, honeſt, faithful miniſter is thrown out of his place, to the great grief of many, and perhaps the biger half of his people ; by what Mr. *Adams* is very fond of calling the *rational* and *diſpaſſionate judgment* of mankind, page 61 : And it will be in vain for Mr. *Adams* to pretend here, that he can't be diſmiſſed to the grief of more than half ; for as before obſerved, it is at their peril if they do not, and there may, yea no doubt will be ſome who are really againſt the diſmiſſion, who yet fear to act againſt it, and numberleſs ſchemes to bring about ſuch an important affair. Neither will it avail for Mr. *Adams* to alledge, that this is a mere conjecture ; for there have been divers inſtances of this kind. And Mr. *Adams* himſelf in his 46th page ſays, *Paul*'s caſe with the *Galatians*, is a very frequent one, and goes on to hint about the people's extolling our Saviour, and ſoon after crying, away with him, away with him. It is plain enough to any one that will read and conſider them affairs, that the people were ſet on to thoſe cryings out againſt *Chriſt* and *Paul*, by the prieſts and judaizing teachers. I cannot ſay indeed how much the miniſters might tamper with the diſaffected in the caſes I have known of : But that the miniſters were diſmiſſed, not for any immorality, nor for any corruption in doctrine ; but appeared to be mainly owing to a diſlike in the neighbouring miniſters. And I knew of one inſtance where (if I miſtake not) there was not above ſix or ſeven diſaffected brethren, out of forty members ; and this ſix or ſeven with their miniſter had a council (the church had no concern with it) the council had ſeveral turn s of meeting, and at laſt drew up a reſult, I cannot ſay juſt how it was worded. But the ſay was, that the council had diſmiſſed him ; and though I do not un-

derſtand, that the church were ſo well indoctrinated in Mr. *Adams*'s notion, as to execute that judgment ; yet it ſeems they viewed the peril ſo great, that they ſuſpended having ordinances, and whether he ever adminiſtered to them again I do not know.

Another inſtance I knew of, where many of the neighbouring miniſters had conceived a diſlike to a certain miniſter, not for any immorality nor corruption in doctrine, and there were two or three diſaffected brethren, out of about forty members ; they got a council, who met time after time, and condemned the miniſter, and finally, when they found the miniſter and people did not pay ſo much deference to them, as they would have, and there appeared (I ſuppoſe) no other way to revenge, they adviſed the diſaffected to ſeparate, and recommended them to the *general court* to get clear of their rates, ſo that Mr. *Adams* is not the only one that favours ſeparations.

Thus it may appear, that the danger of prejudice is not eſcaped by councils. And I do not at all dobut, but there are miniſters and churches which Mr. *Adams* himſelf would not venture his ſtanding with, if it were at ſtake, notwithſtanding all his boaſted *diſintereſtedneſs*, *impartiality*, *rational diſpaſſionate judgment*, and *infalibility* of councils.

But on the other hand, to ſhew the probability of their being prejudiced in favor of each other. So long as Mr. *Adams* allows them to be mankind, and liable to be overcome with temptation, prejudice, &c. If they do amiſs and no one muſt reprove them, as appears by what we have conſidered above, the ſame will operate in council, as well as in private : And if it is any thing they can by any ſhift get off, they, as they are humane ſelfiſh creatures, have the greateſt temptation to plaiſter it up and make nothing of it, and Mr. *Adams* himſelf, has laboured much to prove that the miniſter's ALL depends here ; the miniſter knows who to chooſe for his council, perhaps many of

them his old claſs mates, or them that he has been ſo familiar with, that he truſts if they do not ſcreen him, they will condemn themſelves. In ſhort ſo many things come into conſideration, that it requires but very little diſcernment to ſee that there is the utmoſt chance for prejudice; and no ballance againſt it; but every thing for it; the violent luſt of honor, pride and power, with money too, all beſpeaking and propeling the prejudice of the miniſters in favor of their brother miniſter under trial. So that if a miniſter is a bad man, there is all the chance in the world, that the miniſters in the council ſhall be prejudiced for him; for if he is bad himſelf, he will beſure to chooſe ſuch as he knows are ſo near his own turn, and by perſonal connections, ſufficiently engaged to ſerve the occaſion. But here Mr. *Adams* will ſay, it muſt be a mutual council, and then the people chooſe half; here is a very plauſible ſhew, but when all is done it amounts to a mere ſhadow, for the people have not half the chance the miniſter has. They can only gueſs who are honeſt, and if they ſhould hit right one half, we may reckon they make a good gueſs. So by this time we have a quarter honeſt men, and when they have got there, they dare not preſs any thing, leſt they ſhould offend their brethren, and expoſe themſelves, as in the caſe we conſidered, when miniſters are prejudiced againſt a miniſter; or if there is not that extremity in view, yet they ſhall be alone, and *peck'd at*, and that is uncomfortable: But if after all there ſhould be ſome, that are ſo hardy as that there is any danger of their diſſenting the reſult; the council will vote that the moderator ſhall ſign the reſult in the name of the council, and ſo there is no opportunity for any to put down their diſſent; "and then appearances are ſaved, and all is well." As Mr. *Adams* has it in his 34th page.

But by this time we ſhall perhaps hear Mr. *Adams* cry out, there are the *delegates* to ballance againſt thoſe ter-

rible things, the Neighbour tells of in the miniſters; ſuppoſing that ſhould be really as bad as he ſays.

Here then we will try what help we are to expect from the *delegates*; many times when they ſend, the letter miſſive will reſtrict to one *delegate*; and churches not uſed to contention, may not ſee any trap, or any thing unconſtitutional in that, if any ſhould ſtart at it in the church ſending, there is a ſpecious anſwer, that it will ſave coſt; if any in the churches ſent to, they are ſilenced with ſome of their more credulous brethren, one is enough, the miniſters know beſt about them things; and if none but he went, no matter; and if nothing elſe will ſtop a reſtleſs brother, he may in ſome becoming manner, be twitted with having an itching to go, and poſſibly have the offer of it; by this time whether he accepts or refuſes, he has been ſo *brow-beat*, that any one muſt be very inſolent indeed to ſecond him.

But we will let the matter be ſettled as it will about the number of *delegates*; we will go on to chooſing them. This no doubt is done univerſally by nomination, and ſome times perhaps by a *ſilential vote*; for the miniſters, many of them, are very fond of their *ſilential vote*. But who nominates? Why, who but the miniſter? May not he have a voice who ſhall go with him as his waiting man? So then the vote will ſtand thus:

Brethren if there be no objection, I would propoſe brother-----ſhould go to this council. No body objects.

Then with all proper ſolemnity, it is declared a clear vote !!!!! No-body objects. Why if they ſhould, they muſt bring in their reaſons. And who would be ſo ſaucy, irreligous and regardleſs of the ſabbath, as to raiſe *querelas* in that abrupt manner, upon the Lord's day, when he has perhaps into bargain, juſt been hearing a pathetic ſermon upon brotherly love? He can certainly be deemed nothing

leſs than a litigous fellow, that deſerves to be dealt with ſeverely for his raſhneſs and inſolence.

By the way I mean to be underſtood, that *ſilential votes* in any caſe (where the caſe properly requires *vote)* are a moſt horrid inſult upon the privilege of voting: And it is a groſs ſupineneſs in the people to indulge it.

But we will paſs by *ſilential votes*; ſuppoſe this is not the method for chooſing delegates, in many places where it is commonly uſed in other caſes.

The next caſe is, the miniſter nominates ſtill; if the brethren do not vote, or a tolerable number of them ſo as to call it a choice; then it is a ſlight upon the miniſter, and the perſon nominated, ſo that here the rights of the church are very ſeaſonably and prudently cozened out of their hands.

The next caſe is, The brethren nominate. But previous to the nomination, the miniſter with a gravity and ſolemnity peculiar to his ſacred function, calls upon the brethen to nominate, but with this *proviſo*, there is brother ſuch an one is ſo old, it will be too great a burden for him to go; and brother ----- ſomething is the matter; and brother ----- ****, &c. and when he has thus very diſcretely laid aſide all ſuch ſticks as may not be thought ſo proper for the buſineſs; now brethren you may chooſe who you pleaſe out of the reſt.

But ſuppoſe there is a free choice, the brethren nominate and chooſe without any infringement. Some perhaps one way, and ſome another; get the *delegates* as we can, and go to council.

When they come there, according to *Saybrook platform* there is no vote of council, unleſs a major-part of the miniſters vote it. But if Mr. *Adams* ſhould ſay, *that is nothing to us*, yet it will be found, that it is very much to him, the ſcope of his argument leads to that and reſts upon it. For this he is very abundant in, they muſt be judged by their *peers*; and who can he mean by that but

the miniſters ? *Plough-jogers*, &c. are as much *peers* in the church, as they are in a council. But though it is not in the *Cambridge platform*, that there ſhall be no vote, unleſs where there are a major-part of the miniſters join ; yet Mr. *Adams* is not the only one that has endeavored to introduce that ſcheme.

For if there ſhould be likely to be ſo great a number of delegates in oppoſition to the favourite point in view, as to carry it againſt them ; thoſe that are more docible, may be made to ſign a proteſt againſt the proceedings of the council, becauſe there are not a major-part of the miniſters for it, which will be very plainly ſigning, that delegates are nothing ; and it will bear conſiderable weight for the preſent occaſion, and help to introduce the *Saybrook* ſyſtem.

But there is another way more effectual than that, and *all appearances are ſaved* too ; as Mr. *Adams* ſays, the way is, let the vote be tried ; ſome vote, no matter whether it be the major-part, it may be declared to be a vote at all adventures, if it is a precious point. If ſome ſhould requeſt the negative to be tried ; ſome gentleman zealous for the vote, may ſeverely rebuke him for his impudence, and ſay, *there is no ſuch thing as a negative, it is contrary to all law and rule.* If any one ſhould after this be ſo hardy as to deſire further, that the hands may be counted, the aforeſaid gentleman will with a very good grace ! reply, *they ſhan't be counted, it is a vote* : The moderator no need to ſign it at all ; and ſo *all appearances are ſaved, and all is well*, as Mr. *Adams* ſays : And when a vote has been ſo ratified, it will be affirmed, urged and inſiſted upon, that it is impoſſible to alter, lay aſide, reconſider or farther try or aſſertain ſuch a vote by the council.

Thus we may ſee how Mr. *Adams*'s *rational, diſpaſſionate, unprejudiced, impartial judgment comes* out.

And if after all, when things have been thus prudently managed, and the miniſter's fate thus determined, by ſome

ſeſs than a litigous fellow, that deſerves to be dealt with ſeverely for his raſhneſs and inſolence.

By the way I mean to be underſtood, that *ſilential votes* in any caſe (where the caſe properly requires *vote)* are a moſt horrid inſult upon the privilege of voting: And it is a groſs ſupineneſs in the people to indulge it.

But we will paſs by *ſilential votes*; ſuppoſe this is not the method for chooſing delegates, in many places where it is commonly uſed in other caſes.

The next caſe is, the miniſter nominates ſtill; if the brethren do not vote, or a tolerable number of them ſo as to call it a choice; then it is a ſlight upon the miniſter, and the perſon nominated, ſo that here the rights of the church are very ſeaſonably and prudently cozened out of their hands.

The next caſe is, The brethren nominate. But previous to the nomination, the miniſter with a gravity and ſolemnity peculiar to his ſacred function, calls upon the brethen to nominate, but with this *proviſo*, there is brother ſuch an one is ſo old, it will be too great a burden for him to go; and brother ----- ſomething is the matter; and brother ----- ****, &c. and when he has thus very diſcretely laid aſide all ſuch ſticks as may not be thought ſo proper for the buſineſs; now brethren you may chooſe who you pleaſe out of the reſt.

But ſuppoſe there is a free choice, the brethren nominate and chooſe without any infringement. Some perhaps one way, and ſome another; get the *delegates* as we can, and go to council.

When they come there, according to *Saybrook platform* there is no vote of council, unleſs a major-part of the miniſters vote it. But if Mr. *Adams* ſhould ſay, *that is nothing to us*, yet it will be found, that it is very much to him, the ſcope of his argument leads to that and reſts upon it. For this he is very abundant in, they muſt be judged by their *peers*; and who can he mean by that but

the miniſters ? *Plough-jogers*, &c. are as much *peers* in the church, as they are in a council. But though it is not in the *Cambridge platform*, that there ſhall be no vote, unleſs where there are a major-part of the miniſters join ; yet Mr. *Adams* is not the only one that has endeavored to introduce that ſcheme.

For if there ſhould be likely to be ſo great a number of delegates in oppoſition to the favourite point in view, as to carry it againſt them ; thoſe that are more docible, may be made to ſign a proteſt againſt the proceedings of the council, becauſe there are not a major-part of the miniſters for it, which will be very plainly ſigning, that delegates are nothing ; and it will bear conſiderable weight for the preſent occaſion, and help to introduce the *Saybrook* ſyſtem.

But there is another way more effectual than that, and *all appearances are ſaved* too ; as Mr. *Adams* ſays, the way is, let the vote be tried ; ſome vote, no matter whether it be the major-part, it may be declared to be a vote at all adventures, if it is a precious point. If ſome ſhould requeſt the negative to be tried ; ſome gentleman zealous for the vote, may ſeverely rebuke him for his impudence, and ſay, *there is no ſuch thing as a negative, it is contrary to all law and rule.* If any one ſhould after this be ſo hardy as to deſire further, that the hands may be counted, the aforeſaid gentleman will with a very good grace ! reply, *they ſhan't be counted, it is a vote* : The moderator no need to ſign it at all ; and ſo *all appearances are ſaved, and all is well*, as Mr. *Adams* ſays : And when a vote has been ſo ratified, it will be affirmed, urged and inſiſted upon, that it is impoſſible to alter, lay aſide, reconſider or farther try or aſſertain ſuch a vote by the council.

Thus we may ſee how Mr. *Adams*'s *rational, diſpaſſionate, unprejudiced, impartial judgment comes* out.

And if after all, when things have been thus prudently managed, and the miniſter's fate thus determined, by ſome

ſuch *rational diſpaſſionate* proceedings, ſo as that he may think himſelf in *good circumſtances*, if there ſhould be any of the delegates of the council ſo refractory, as to be uneaſy with their miniſter, for the part he has acted to ſave his brethren, they may juſtly be looked upon *ſchiſmaticks, ſtirers up of ſtrife* ; for trying to fling the fire into their own churches, they may be very ſeverely frowned upon ; for if it was ſuch a crime for *Bolton* brethren to apply to ſiſter churches, to know whether they were in charity with them, if they, their wives and their children ¶ were all deſervedly buried in the valley of *Achor*, (i. e. *trouble*) under a great heap of miniſterial bulls : Of how much ſorer puniſhment, ſhall thoſe *delegates* be thought worthy, who ſet up to deſpiſe, and to find fault with what their own Rev. paſtor has done, and to bring fire into their own church ? No doubt as much worſe as *ſelf-murder* is worſe than other *murder*.

But be it as it will, as to theſe *refractory delegates*, there is no danger from that quarter, ſo long as what is done in council, is no way to be called in queſtion by any of the churches who have ſent : Which Mr. *Adams* is ſo full in page 61, 62 : And when as he has it in his 70th page, " mutual councils are juſtly looked upon as the end of the conſtitution, from them there is no appeal." What then can a few reſtleſs refractory delegates do ; or even if there ſhould happen to be an *aukward imitator* of a miniſter ? † They are part of the council, and it muſt be reckoned as

---

¶ It is to be obſerved that the *children* of thoſe *Bolton* members have been refuſed ordinances abroad, becauſe parents were againſt Mr. *Goſs*.

† This has reference to what he ſays in his 86th page, meaning as we muſt gather from the whole, that one who don't hold to his plan of councils, and negativing the votes of the churches, is no goſpel miniſter ; but has

their ACT, if they were never ſo much againſt it; they have got to the end, and there need be no danger from them, the *miniſter's fate* is determined, ſo that he may *think himſelf in good circumſtances*, as Mr. *Adams* ſays, "He ſtill ſtands *rectus in eccleſia*; tho' the people know him to be unfit for his office, and be obliged in duty to withdraw from him; yet he is ſtill juſtly intitled to the ſupport they at firſt contracted with him for, neither is it in their power to withhold it," page 52d, and then no doubt *all is well!!!* When the people cannot withold his ſalary, and no help for them, having got to the end of the conſtitution; the miniſter's fate is fixed in good circumſtances, and the people's fate is in as *bad circumſtances*, being bound by a reſult, which in the ſame page, he ſays, "they are in conſcience bound to reject; and unable to withhold a full ſalary from one, from whom they are bound in duty to withdraw;" and therefore deſerves not a farthing! And not only ſo; but if they withdraw in oppoſition to a reſult, all the *churches* are, or ought to be out of charity with them, ſee his 63d, 64th pages; and no body may go and ſo much as preach to them, under pain of being *charged with ſupporting of ſchiſm*, much leſs to adminiſter ordinances to them; neither may they nor their poſterity have or enjoy any ordinances abroad, or enter into the congregation of the Lord, I ſuppoſe *forever*; for Mr. *Adams*, and thoſe he writes for the *benefit* of, have made no limitation.

Mr. *Adams* ſays, page 52d, "This is confeſſedly a hard caſe, that people muſt ſupport a miniſter whom they cannot in conſcience hear." But he has diſcovered no

---

only an *aukward imitation* of the office, in which fling at the miniſters of Chriſt, the public will eaſily ſee, that he has not an *aukward*, but an *ample imitation* of old *Diotrepes*, who prated maliciouſly againſt the apoſtles, who allowed the church their privileges. See IIId epiſtle of *John*.

hardſhips in their being ſhut out from all goſpel privileges, which may give very good reaſon to conclude that *worldly profit* is moſt at heart with him, ſince he ſo plainly diſcovers the hardſhips in being deprived of that ; and none in being deprived of goſpel privileges. And therefore tho' he ſays it is *the moſt contemptible idea*, to ſuppoſe that the people will be influenced and reſtrained in their actions by the conſideration of worldly intereſt and comfort ; yet he himſelf makes it *the all* for the miniſter, and ſees no hardſhip for the people but where money is at ſtake. And an inſtance of that hardſhip he ſays " will probably never happen, if the council or councils that are judges in the caſe " have had the evidence of their unworthineſs properly laid before them." Here comes out the *infalibility* ! it can be upon no other than his old ſcheme that *councils are ſomething ſuperior to mankind*, which he has in his laſt piece ſaid ſo much to wipe off. I underſtand it has been a queſtion that has ſome times laboured hard to determine, where the *infalibility* lay ; whether in the *pope*, or in the *council*. Mr. *Adams* has diſcovered the *infalibility* to be in the *council*, for which ſome have thought that he might very properly be honored with the dignity of a *Cardinal*. But I rather gueſs his *Holineſs* would not confer that honnor upon him, ſince ſuch a diſcovery would be derogatory to the infalibility of the Holy See. However, I have no doubt but he might have *inſcribed his anſwer* to the council of the Conclave, and it would have been as acceptable as the *Neighbour* was to Col. *John*, and Capt. *Aſa Whetcomb*, which would have ſaved him his grievous lamentation of having no body to *patronize* it. But leaving Mr. *Adams* to ſolace himſelf as he can—

I obſerve he ſuppoſes this infalibility, provided the evidence is properly laid before the council. I truſt the public are well enough ſatisfied, that in the *Bolton* affair, the council would not hear, or pay any regard to the evidence

when it was laid before them, notwithſtanding all Mr. *Adams* has ſaid to the contrary.

Upon the whole, by what I have ſaid of the management of councils, both againſt and for a miniſter, ſhewing the chance, probability and danger there is of prejudice in councils, and nothing to ballance or weigh againſt it; but every thing for it; the luſt of pride, power, honor and profit, all propeling to ſuch a prejudice. And on the other hand, how great a balance there is in the people againſt it; who by nature are no more inclined to prejudice than councils; I truſt it ſufficiently appears, as I ſaid before, that the people are the moſt proper judges in theſe affairs.

But I have no doubt but Mr. *Adams* will find fault with, at leaſt ſneer at what I have ſaid about the management of councils, wherein I have ſhewn the probability of their being prejudiced, and ſay there is nothing in it. But that I ſhall leave to the public, nothing doubting what I have ſaid upon theſe things are ſo well known, that there will be ſufficient witneſs to the truth of what I have obſerved in that reſpect; and I truſt, by what has been ſaid, the public are well ſatisfied that the people are more likely to do juſtice, and leſs likely to act with prejudice, than councils. This ſeems to be one grand hinge on which all that Mr. *Adams* has advanced turns; and as he pretends to lay ſo much ſtreſs upon what he ſuppoſes were the ſentiments of the fathers who compiled the platform; it may not perhaps be diſagreable to the public for me to give ſome ſhort ſketch of the ſentiments of one of the fathers, who wrote about the time the platform was compiled. Mr. *John Davenport*, B. D. a famous *New-England* divine, in his book intitled, THE CHURCHES CHARTER, page 116, having recited *Mat.* XVI. 19, ſays, "Theſe words hold forth the ratification of Chriſt's grant of the KEYS unto a congregational church, with the chiefty of power,

under Chriſt, to manage the ſame within themſelves."— After having ſaid many things to illuſtrate and confirm his point, he obſerves ſome will ſay a *particular church may err in judgment, and therefore appeal may be made* : To which he anſwers in the 118th page, that " if poſſibility of erring in judgment, be a warrantable ground of appealing from particular churches, then the appeal muſt be made to ſuch a Tribunal and Judge, as cannot err, which is to be found only in heaven." He goes on to ſpeak of councils, &c. erring, that they may and have erred ; and in ſhort, brings it out to juſt what I have alledged above, that councils are more likely to err than particular churches in their proper concernments. He concludes his argument upon this particular with theſe words, " Chriſt, who well knew what is in man, and what is beſt for the good of his people, hath given unto his particular churches, notwithſtanding their poſſibility of erring, an indiſpenſible power of judgment, in their own matters, within themſelves." And in his 155th page, he, by natural and concluſive argument, ſhews that particular churches are more likely to do juſtly, and deal tenderly with a delinquent brother than councils, claſſis or ſynods. In his 153d page, " If the elders and meſſengers of churches aſſembled in a ſynod, ſhall determine any thing contrary to the rule, and prejudicial to the intireneſs of the churches power within it ſelf, the church may, and ought to refuſe ſuch ſanctions, as not being ſancited by the Lord." In his 139th page, he obſerves, that " the preſcription of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt is, *Tell the church ; and if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen and publican.* But he who appeals from the church, doth not hear the church. Therefore he that ſo doth, deſerves to be cut off, by the ſentence of Chriſt."

Such were the ſentiments of that venerable father, who was in great repute, and particularly this performance of

his, both in *Europe* and *America* among the congregationals. So that notwithſtanding Mr. *Adams*'s pretended diſcovery of the ſentiments of the fathers, it appears that one of the moſt noted of them was entirely againſt him, as to his notion of councils; and that it was entirely coincident with mine, that the people are more likely to do juſtice than a council.

I now proceed to conſider another grand hinge upon which Mr. *Adams*'s ſcheme very much turns. And that is, that *advice* and *judgment* both mean the ſame thing.

Nothing is more redundant than Mr. *Adams* is in inſiſting upon it, that in diſmiſſing a miniſter, councils (where they can be had) are the only conſtitutional judges, the only judges, and phraſes to the ſame purport: And yet he frequently owns that councils are ONLY ADVISORY; that they have NO JURIDICAL POWER, &c. In his ſermon he advanced very much the ſame; and in my former Treatiſe I obſerved an inconſiſtency. Mr. *Adams* has now took it up, and ſaid many fooliſh things to vindicate it. That councils are only *adviſory* has been ſaid by many beſides Mr. *Adams*; but that *adviſory* and *judiciary* authority both mean the ſame thing, to me is entirely new. I ſcarce know whether the public will think this deſerves an animadverſion. I ſhould as ſoon have expected he would ſeriouſly tell us that *red* and *white* were both the ſame thing. However as this is now become a cardinal point in the controverſy, there ſeems a neceſſity to ſay ſomething particular upon it, leſt he ſhould be wiſe in his own conceit.

Firſt, I muſt take notice of ſome things he has advanced to clear himſelf of this inconſiſtency, and eſtabliſh ſo important a point.

1. He tries to father it upon the platform, page 36, ſays he "adopted the language of the platform, and that

" he has ſaid nothing more nor leſs than that does in relation to the ſame thing," and refers to the chapters on communion of churches and ſynods. By turning to thoſe chapters we find, firſt that we may have occaſion to require the judgment and counſel of other churches, touching any perſon or cauſe, wherewith they may be better acquainted than ourſelves. Another place it ſpeaks of particular churches approving and accepting the *judgment* of a ſynod. In the next chapter, ſpeaking about what belongs to ſynods and councils, that it is to debate and determine controverſies of faith, and caſes of conſcience, to clear from the word, holy directions, &c. But then in the ſame ſection—They are not to exerciſe any act of church authority or juriſdiction. But according to Mr. *Adams*, councils are *conſtituted judges*: The platform that they are to exerciſe no act of *juriſdiction*; and yet Mr. *Adams* ſays that he ſaid nothing more nor leſs than the platform. I wiſh he had remembered his reſolution of care to keep truth of his ſide.

It is plain enough to any one that will conſider of it, that what the platform ſpeaks of councils *debating* and *determining*, it means to clear up truths from the ſcripture, as the *Jeruſalem* council did, and demonſtrate what is the mind of God from his word and works, ſo as to enlighten and convince any that may be at a loſs in any point, and not to think to impoſe their judgment or ſentence; or if to treat churches as children or aſſes, call their ſentence only *advice*, to ſound ſoft, ſo as not to ſtart the church. It matters not what it is called; if Mr. *Aaams* is a mind to trifle with words, and call a *hatchel* a *pillow*, and a *horn-bug* an *eye-ſtone*, he may with as much ſenſe as to ſay that *conſtituted judges* are only *adviſory*: And he may for himſelf, lay his own head up on a *hatchel*, and put *bugs* in his own eyes, and have his adviſers *conſtituted judges* if he pleaſes, provided he gets no body's elſe head and e yes on

the hatchel full of bugs, nor their conſciences hampered with reſults of councils; nor privileges of goſpel ordinances undermined by miniſterial combinations, nor their purſes pillaged, by maintaining thoſe they know to be unworthy.

But Mr. *Adams* farther to make out his ſcheme, that councils are *conſtituted judges*, and yet only *adviſory*, ſame, viz. 36th page, ſays, "they cannot enforce their judgments or determinations by coercive power." What does he mean by this? when in other places he is full of it, that if a church dont obey or conform to the reſult, then all the churches are, or ought to be out of fellowſhip with that church; eſpecially all ſuch whoſe meſſengers were upon the council; and in the 54th page, that they may, and ought to withdraw communion from ſuch church. What, is here no *coercive power* in this! *coercive* means to keep in, reſtrain or compel. And is here no reſtraint or compulſion? If Mr. *Adams* ſets nothing by goſpel ordinances, ſo as that it would be no compulſion to him, or reſtraint upon him, to be ſhut out from them, I truſt all be not like him, there are ſome I hope and truſt, who ſet by goſpel privileges and ordinances, ſo that it would be a very great reſtraint to be hedged up from them. But look two or three lines farther, there he ſays, "It is very poſſible for councils to hear, judge and determine a matter, without having their judgments enforced by ſecular power." No body diſputes but councils may judge, and what not; and never have their doings enforced by the ſecular power, nor any other; and there are many of their reſults and determinations, I have no doubt it is a pity they ever ſhould be enforced at all. But Mr. *Adams* is not willing it ſhould go off ſo, that reſults of councils ſhould not be enforced by the ſecular power, as he pretends in the above quoted paſſage: he is for having the ſecular power enforce the reſult of council, whether it be good or bad.

For in his 52d page, " If a council ſhould direct a people to ſit down eaſy with an elder whom they know to be unworthy of his office—they are bound in conſcience to reject ſuch reſult, and to withdraw from their unworthy elder;—yet he is juſtly intitled to the ſupport they at firſt contracted to give him, neither is it in the power of his people to with-hold it." How ſo? Why cannot the people with-hold it? Why turn to the 55th page, there you will find he ſays, that " if councils judge the miniſter has fulfilled the conditions of the contract on his part, the civil authority or judges of our courts of law are to put forth the coercive power, with which they are veſted, and compel them to do it." i. e. compel the people to pay him his ſalary. We find this further confirmed in the ſame page near the bottom. " Should the miniſter be neceſſitated to apply to the civil authority for his ſalary, the only queſtion neceſſary to be determined is, whether he is or is not their conſtitutional miniſter? Of this queſtion, judges of law, as ſuch, are not the proper judges. To an eccleſiaſtical judicature it belongs to decide it: To the eccleſiaſtical council therefore, who are the conſtitutional judges of this matter they are to go for the reſolution of this queſtion; an anſwer to which they will find contained in their *reſult*; and if by this it appears that they judged he was not unworthy of his office—then they muſt give him his ſalary."

Here we ſee he ſays the *only queſtion* to be determined when the miniſter has to ſue for his ſalary, the council muſt determine; and if the court finds that the council have determined it in favor of the miniſter, the court *muſt* give him his ſalary. It is plain enough by what has been hinted from theſe pages, that Mr. *Adams* means to have the determinations of his *councils of judicature* enforced by coercive power, both civil and religious, even to the taking away the peoples money, and depriving them of goſpel

ordinances, and that whether their determinations are juſt or not. It is well our lives are ſpared thro' his abundant clemency! However we may by this time ſee what his *conſtituded judges* are to do, whoſe *reſult* is only adviſory, and not to be enforced by any coercive or ſecular power.

In the 37th page Mr *Adams* ſays, his "Remarker appears to have his mind ſo filled with ideas of law and courts of juſtice, that he thinks every thing abſurd that does not conform to thoſe ideas and rules. Hence becauſe the judgments of civil judges are binding by coercive power, he fooliſhly enough argues, that no perſon can be a judge, even in an eccleſiaſtical court, whoſe determination is only adviſory." The reader will obſerve I don't charge him with having his mind filled with ideas of courts of *juſtice*: His mind ſeems rather to be filled with courts of *injuſtice*; eccleſiaſtical *courts*, whoſe determination is only *adviſory*, without any coercive power depriving people of goſpel privileges, who do their duty, and go according to their conſcience, and binding them to ſupport a miniſter they know to be unworthy; and if the people refuſe to pay, then the civil court muſt make them, aſking no queſtion, only whether *their eminences* § have determined it ſo!!!

I truſt the public will eaſily ſee that his mind is as much filled as mine, with the ideas of *courts*, though not of *juſtice*: and that his book is as much, and more filled than mine with terms of *law*, courts, judges, power, money, ſtipends, &c. &c. However, obſerving theſe things I don't *ſuſpect* as he does about the Neighbour, *that ſome* juſtice *of a very ſlender capacity had a hand in it*. I rather hope there could not be found a *juſtice* of a capacity ſo ſlender as to provide the rough materials for ſuch a

---

§ *Eminence* is a title given to cardinals, who are the *pope*'s council, or council of the conclave.

ſtructure as his. † Before I diſmiſs this important queſtion, viz. Whether *advice* and *judgment* both mean the ſame thing, (having ſhewn how Mr. *Adams* argues upon it) I will offer ſomething myſelf, ſhewing the difference of them terms, as they are uſed in common language; withal ſome farther expoſing Mr. *Adams*'s notion, and ſo leave it to the public to ſay who is moſt right, he or I.

In which I obſerve,

The word *judgment* is applied in both a *logical* and *legal* ſenſe. *Judgment* in a *logical* ſenſe means a faculty, or rather act of the ſoul, whereby it compares it's ideas, and perceives their agreement or diſagreement. But *judgment* in law, is the ſentence of the judges upon a ſuit, which is binding, and determines the ſtate of thoſe concerning whom it is made;—in this ſenſe we may conſider *judgment* whenever the reſult of the mind viewing things, is to determine our own, or others ſtates or actions. *Advice* ſeems properly to mean the ſetting before the mind the arrang-

---

† Since I have mentioned what Mr. *Adams* ſays page 38, about a *juſtice of a ſlender capacity* having a hand in my former Treatiſe; every one who reads it may know he aims at Col. *Whetcomb*, to aſperſe him. I therefore take this opportunity, to declare to the world, that the Col. had not from me, and I am very certain he had not from any body elſe, the leaſt knowledge or grounds to miſtruſt any ſuch thing was in hand by any body, till it came to him at *Boſton*, from he knew not who. And I have good aſſurance he has not been told who the Neighbour is to this day, and all the gueſs I ever heard of his making he miſſed in his gueſs. I can't but remark that Mr. *Adams*'s inſolence is wonderful, in pointing ſuch aſperſions at the Col. ſince he therein ſo daringly reflected, not only on the Col. and on the town who have for many years betruſted him as their repreſentative; but alſo on the whole elective body of the province, who after many years proof of his underſtanding and probity, accounted him worthy of a ſeat at the honorable council board of this province.

ment, compariſon or aſſemblage of *ideas* which is the proper exerciſe of the mind in forming a *judgment*, ſo as that he to whom it belongs, is better able to make up *judgment* in a legal ſenſe; ſo that he who gives *advice*, although he neceſſarily *judges* in the affair, in a *logical* ſenſe; yet in common uſe of words he is no *judge*, nor does he make up any *judgment* in a *legal* ſenſe; but only communicates to him who is to *judge*, aſſiſtance to form a right *judgment*; agreably *Mather in his Ratio Diſcipl.* page 172, ſpeaking of our *New-England* ſynods ſays, "They pretend to no *juridical power*; nor any ſignificancy but what is merely *inſtructive* and *ſuaſory*." Hence ſome ſpeaking of churches and councils, have expreſſed it, that it is the churches prerogative to *judge*, and councils main province to reflect light, in order that churches might judge uprightly.

Now becauſe in giving advice, offering light, &c. there muſt be the exerciſe of the judgment in a *logical* ſenſe, and the platform uſes it ſo ſpeaking of councils; therefore Mr. *Adams* fooliſhly enough (as he ſpeaks of the Neighbour) concludes that councils are to be judges in a legal ſenſe, and as I have above ſhewn, runs up his *conſtituted judges* which are only *adviſory*, to the higheſt pitch of deſpotiſm.

To cloſe this grand queſtion about councils being *judges* and only adviſory, I ſhall inſert a few paſſages from Dr. *Stiles's Chriſtian Union*, who, though not an ancient writer, yet *in all reſpects* Mr. *Adams's ſuperior* (as he ſays about the Neighbour page 75th) and the Dr. may be allowed very good authority, as one of the fathers, ſince what he ſays is ſo much built upon ancient writers.

The Dr. in his 39th page, ſpeaking of the gradual encroachments of the clergy in former times, among other things, he mentions their acting as *councils, which* (he ſays) *have proved the grand ſources of corruption and tyranny.*

The Dr. in his 45th page ſpeaking of our congregational churches ſays, "that what ought to be deemed the

ſubject of eccleſiaſtical animadverſion, every church is a complete judge of, and perhaps is ſeldom miſtaken."

He goes on in the next page and ſays, that if they may ſometimes be at a loſs, and have recourſe to a council, yet they reſerve to themſelves liberty to receive or refuſe ſuch advice when given. Same page he ſays, " Therefore though our churches in forming their deciſions in matters of diſcipline, make application to a council—yet the congregational churches univerſally hold a negative on the reſult of that council, or rather the deciſion of ſuch council is of no force, till received and ratified by the inviting church, nor does it render that church obnoxious to the vicinity, if ſhe recedes from the opinion of the council."

The Doctor ſpeaking about councils page 48th, quotes the following words from *Mather's Ratio Diſcipl.* page 173. " When they (i.e. councils) have done all, the churches are at liberty to *judge* how far their advice is to be followed." The Docter adds, " Thus ſtrictly ſpeaking, congregational councils have no power at all." The Docter in his 60th page, ſpeaking of the opinions of the fathers, viz. Reverend Mr. *Cotton*, Reverend Mr. *Davenport*, and Reverend Mr. *Richard Mather*, one of the compilers of the platform, he ſays, " theſe gentlemen were intirely againſt the deciſive authority of councils—or that they ſhould be veſted with power to enforce their decrees with a penalty of non-communion, they would have them to give their opinion and adviſe on difficult caſes, as readers of divinity in the univerſity, or men learned in the uſages and cuſtoms of the churches. They were to the churches, if I may borrow an illuſtration from high example, what the privy council are to the king.—If the church received their advice it had force ;———nor was any church to be hereticated for not approving the reſult of a ſynod or council." The Doctor after having ſaid many things to the

like purpoſe, ſays, "This I take to be a juſt ſummary of the opinion of the fathers on eccleſiaſtical polity in general, and the conſtitution of councils in particular." And then he goes on to enumerate ſeveral of the fathers by name, their writings, and ſome extracts from them, and in his 62d page has the following words from Mr. *Hooker* (who was one of the fathers at the time the platform was compoſing) ſpeaking of ſynods ſays, "They ſet down their determinations, and ſo return them to the particular churches whence they came, and their determinations take place, not becauſe they concluded ſo, but becauſe the churches approved of what they have determined."

Thus I truſt I have ſufficiently anſwered Mr. *Adams*'s notion of councils being *conſtituted judges*, and yet only *adviſory*; ſhewn the abſurdity of it, and that the fathers and other worthy writers are of my ſide the queſtion. This and his notion about councils being the moſt likely to do *juſtice*, which I have alſo anſwered, ſeem to be the two main hinges on which his whole ſcheme turns.

I now proceed to make ſome ſhort and general remarks on ſome other paſſages which ought not to be omitted.

What he ſays in his 61ſt and 62d pages about my 13th page, where I ſpake of the propriety and duty of councils making return of what they have done, I ſhould ſuppoſe that what I have hinted from the fathers, &c. were ſufficient to anſwer all Mr. *Adams* has ſaid upon that; only as he has ſaid ſome things upon it not true; and alſo ſome who are friends to the cauſe I am upon, have thought that clauſe did not ſtand ſo well as it might; ſuppoſing that ſome might be led by this to conclude that the inviting church could not ſafely accept of the reſult, till it had received a ſanction in the invited churches; or that it would be of no avail or authority till that was done. The candid reader will then pleaſe to obſerve, that when I ſpake

of "the reſults of councils needing the ſanction of the churches to make them of any avail," I had hinted the affair of the churches voting charity with *Bolton* church. This voting charity implied a queſtion whether they were ſo? I ſuppoſed the pretended reaſon for their being out of charity, was becauſe *Bolton* church had not accepted the reſult of council, therefore when I ſaid that the reſult needed the ſanction of the invited churches to make them of any avail, it means any *avail* to break fellowſhip or charity, and immediately I quoted the platform, chapter XV. ſect. 2. where treating on the third way of communion, the only way the platform knows of, to caſt a church out of fellowſhip. The platform ſays, "particular churches approving and accepting the judgment of the ſynod," &c. And the whole I ſay afterward is of the ſame tenor. But the authority of the reſult, the reader will remember I conſidered as being altogether, in its being according to the word of God and reaſon; and therefore if the inviting church can accept it as ſuch, ſhe has full authority to do it, whether it is ever accepted by the invited churches or not. And the reader will eaſily ſee by what I have adduced from the fathers, that however churches may differ as to their acceptance of a reſult, yet they are not to be conſidered as out of charity or fellowſhip with each other, and that councils ſhould make return of their doings to their reſpective churches. The caſe is plain for councils to be judges of evidence and matters of fact, according to his notion, as a court of judicature. There would be an inſignificancy in their making return; but to adviſe as to points of faith and practice upon the caſe laid before them, according to the word of God; opening, illuſtrating and comparing facts with the word of God, as the *Jeruſalem* council did, ſo as to inſtruct and enlighten the mind. The whole church can be judges of it as well as the meſſengers that go, and if they have diſ-

covered any thing valuable, their own churches ought to have the benefit of it; and if they have made any miſtake the church may have a chance to diſcover it, and may do their meſſengers good by ſhewing them their error. Thus we find in the *Jeruſalem* council, *it pleaſed the apoſtles and elders, with the whole church*, to ſend, &c. Acts XV. 22. But it could not *pleaſe the whole church* unleſs they had a hearing of the reſult. Hence Mr. *Adams* may ſee, that I take this extraordinary poſition from divine writ as well as from the fathers. I will juſt obſerve one thing more in this place, and it may ſave me ſaying any thing farther of what he ſays as to the *buſineſs of councils*. And that with reſpect to witneſſes before councils. There is no doubt, but a delinquent may diſpute the proof of his crimes, as well as other things; and in ſuch caſe the church may lay before the council what evidence they have, and the council ought to compare it with the direction in the word of God, concerning proof of crimes, againſt a perſon, and if they diſcover the church inclined to take that for proof which is not ſo, according to ſcripture, then they muſt inſtruct, and endeavor to convince and perſuade into the truth; or if they ſee that the church are like to miſs and not take that for proof, which is ſo according to ſcripture, to enlighten them in that. And this, if I miſtake not, is all that councils have to do with witneſſes; for the judgment finally iſſues from the church, who are the ſole judicature in eccleſiaſtical cauſes, as is above ſhewn, and Mr. *Adams* himſelf, in his 44th page, ſays, that the power of juriſdiction is in the church.

I may next take notice of what he ſays about the authority of councils.

And firſt, What he ſays page 40, of a reſult's having *binding force* in it without *appearing to agree with the word of God*. He ſeems to ſuppoſe, that a reſult may be agreable to the word of God, and not appear to be ſo. Hence that it has *binding force* in it when it don't *appear*

An inviſible *binding force!* For to apply it to the affair we are upon; the people declared it to be above their comprehenſion: But bring it to the principles of the platform and the fathers, and Mr. *Adams* too, and reſults are only *adviſory, inſtructive* or *enlightning*, the force of which can't conſiſt in any unſeen power or force; but in ſome light being communicated to the mind.

As to what he ſays page 71ſt, of my giving a partial account of the authority or *binding force* of councils or their reſults; becauſe he ſays they are an ordinance of God, for which he brings in the platform. But the platform ſays, *without their agreeing, they bind not at all.* Therefore if that is wanting, there is no *authority* or *binding force*; and the apoſtle ſays, *though we or an angel from heaven preach any other goſpel*, &c. *let him be accurſed. Gal.* 1. 8. And ſo if any council draw up a reſult contrary to the word of God, let them be accurſed, inſtead of being regarded as having any *authority* or *binding force.* For I don't think Mr. *Adams* himſelf will pretend they are any more an ordinance of God than the apoſtles were. It is plain by the platform that when their agreement with the word of God is wanting, all *binding force* is wanting. And what Mr. *Adams* ſhould carp upon that for, I can't conceive; unleſs he would have it be thought that councils and miniſters have ſome authority, ſo as that what they ſay ſhould be received upon that: And then his *holineſs* has good authority for all his impoſitions upon the church, and the people have no right to call it in queſtion.

As I am now upon what he has ſaid againſt my definition of councils, I would juſt obſerve, that as to the *uſe of councils*, I don't find he has ſaid any thing worth ramark, otherwiſe than what he has ſaid in the fore part of his book, and therefore is properly anſwered in what I have ſaid already.

Having gone over what he has ſaid about councils, worthy of remark: Before I paſs to the other parts I will make ſome general obſervations upon his notion of councils.

OBSERVATION I.

Mr. *Adams* makes the binding force of councils to be binding on men's eſtates, though not on their conſciences, page 52d, by the reſult of councils they are obliged to ſupport a miniſter, which they are *bound in conſcience* and *obliged in duty* to reject. And the whole drift of this book is, that the reſult of councils ſhould bind men's eſtates. But the platform makes the binding force of councils to conſiſt, in their being according to ſcripture, which therefore binds only on the conſcience. Therefore his councils are repugnant to the platform.

OBSERVATION II.

Scripture councils take off burdens; Mr. *Adams*'s councils put on moſt heavy burdens; non-communion, paying money for nothing, &c. therefore anti-ſcriptural.

OBSERVATION III.

Mr. *Adams* himſelf, in his 71ſt page allows, that the whole binding force or authority of councils, conſiſts in their being an ordinance of God, and their reſult being according to the word of God. But there is no ordinance of God in his word, that councils ſhall be *conſtituted judges* to determine men's eſtates.

But Mr. *Adam*'s *councils* though they draw up a reſult contrary to the word of God, it muſt determine men's eſtates, let their *duty* and *conſcience* go where they can, vid. page 52.

Therefore his ſcheme of councils being *conſtituted judges* as he tells of, is contrary to ſcripture, platform and himſelf.

However I ſhall not dwell upon his inconſiſtencies with himſelf here; but give a catalogue of them by and by. But before I proceed to that, I muſt make a few remarks

upon what he has ſaid about the *negative power*, and about the *keys*.

Mr. *Adams* when he firſt begins upon the *negative power*, page 75th, gives it all up. Says "it is only a ſilent non-conſent to the acts of the brotherhood," and goes on to ſay that it is *no more than every other man has a right, and in ſome caſes bound in conſcience to do.* This no body that I know of ever diſputed. But in his 79th page, this ſilent non-conſent makes a *church act of no validity*. And in his 82d page, it is a *power always laying by them*, &c. His notion to make out this tranſit, is, that a miniſter is a ruler. This neither does any body diſpute that I know of; moſt certainly my former Treatiſe was very full in allowing this.

His notion evidently appears to be that miniſters are no rulers, unleſs they have this *negative* upon the acts of the church. But this notion is groſsly futile, and contrary to known experience. The governor of *Connecticut* has no ſort of negative upon the court nor council; if the houſe of repreſentatives, and major part of the council paſs an act, it is a law to all intents and purpoſes, whatever the govenor may think of it. And that I ſuppoſe is as reſpectable well regulated government as any upon the continent; and by what I have underſtood, that was the caſe with this government under the old *charter*, which Mr. *Turner* in his election ſermon laſt *May*, ſays was *inhumanly murdered*, page 18th. And in every town or pariſh meeting, the moderator is a ruler, and has great authority to puniſh offenders. And yet he has no negative upon the acts of the town or pariſh. I might inſtance in ſundry other bodies, ſo that Mr. *Adams*'s pretending that it makes a miniſter no more than a private brother, not to have this *negative*, or that he is no ruler without it, is ſtupid and futile to the laſt degree.

Dr. *Stiles* before mentioned, ſpeaking of ancient times, about the time the platform was compoſed, in his 64th

page ſays, " The churches would not bear an actual negative of the elderſhip, whether in a ſingle perſon or more." The Doctor goes on to ſpeak many things well worth tranſcribing had I time, and in his 68th page, refering to ſome clauſes in the platform about the power of *rule* and power of *privilege*, ſays, " Under the umbrage of thoſe clauſes, the paſtors of ſome churches purely congregational, have claimed and aſſumed this power (i. e. a negative on the church). But according to the principles of congregationaliſm, the paſtor beſide being moderator of church meetings, or preſident of the chriſtian fraternity, has but the authority of a private brother, in the rule and government of the church." By this time Mr. *Adams* may ſee that his ſcheme of negativing is an innovation, to overthrow and deſtroy the ancient principles upon which theſe churches ſettled.

But Mr. *Adams* tells about the miniſter's conſcience ! No body wants to infringe upon his conſcience ; we are as willing he ſhould have his *ſilent non-conſent*, as well as a private brother ; or if he has a mind to expreſs his *non-conſent*, we won't quarrel with him about that neither. But he ſays " there are ſome votes cannot be carried into execution but by their means, and therefore they may be obliged to go directly repugnant to the dictates of their own conſciences." But pray what mighty things has the miniſter to do, reſpecting the votes of the church, that ſo infringe upon his conſcience ? He as moderator, muſt collect the votes of the church ; and he as moderator or paſtor, may atteſt ſuch to be the votes of the church ; it can't hurt his conſcience to declare and atteſt the truth. Suppoſe it is to cenſure a member which he thinks not guilty, or at leaſt not equal to what the church lay upon him ; can't he declare that to be the mind of the church ? If we conſider the epiſtles to the *Corinthians*, we ſhall find that cenſures are the work of the church. The cenſure of the inceſtuous perſon, was a *puniſhment inflicted of many*,

*2 Cor.* II. 5. which no doubt meant the body of the church. And can't the miniſter declare this puniſhment of many when that is the truth, without militating againſt his own conſcience? O! Mr. *Adams* ſays, page 78, "if they vote he ſhall preach *hereſy*, he muſt comply;—their ſovereign mandates muſt be inſtantly obeyed, whether juſt or unjuſt." This he pretends will be the caſe upon my ſcheme. But this is materially falſe, in two reſpects, to pretend this from what I wrote. For, to pretend that a vote of the people, when contrary to the mind of the miniſter, muſt be inſtantly put in execution, is well known to be falſe, to all ſuch as have carefully read my former Treatiſe; there I ſpecially ſpeak about *ſuſpending the affairs* in ſuch caſe. So alſo to pretend that upon my ſcheme, if the people ſhould vote the miniſter ſhould preach *hereſy*, he muſt comply is falſe; for this would be making a *law*, and I utterly denied any ſuch power belonging to the church, and ſaid *that if they were to make laws, he ought, to have a negative, or ſome way to be freed from being ſubject to laws he in no ſenſe conſented to.* But Mr. *Adams* ſays page 80, that churches are legiſlative bodies; and mentions in particular that they may make ordinances as to *time* and *place*. I can't tell what he means by this, unleſs he ſuppoſes that the church, provided the miniſter concur, may alter the ſabbath, or fix the meeting-houſe; them ſeem to be the main things as to *time* and *place*, that the church, *as ſuch*, are concerned with; as to *time* and *place* of church meetings, the elderſhip, whether ſingle or plural, generally determine that, and no body diſputes it.

But Mr. *Adams* in his 78th page, ſays miniſters are *ſtewards*. Very well: and the church is the *wife*; and (as *Joſeph* told his miſtreſs) *There is none greater in this houſe than I, neither hath he kept back any thing from me, but thee, becauſe thou art his wife*, Gen. XXXIX. 9. Tho' there be none greater in the houſe than the *ſteward*, as it

was with *Joſeph*, who was *Potipher's ſteward*; yet the wife is never committed into the hands of the ſteward. And ſo though there be none greater in the houſe of God than the miniſter, who is the *ſteward*; yet the church, the *wife*, is not committed into his hands, but is ſtill the right and lawful proprietor and owner of all, in the abſence of her Huſband; and is ſtill properly in ſuch relation to the ſteward, that ſhe has a right to diſplace him upon his delinquency; and if a church ſhould invite a miniſter to commit unlawful acts with her, and he ſhould refuſe as *Joſeph* did his miſtreſs, and they ſhould turn him away for it, as ſhe did, calling in other ſervants to aſſiſt in her horrid plan: I ſay, though any church ſhould turn away a faithful *ſteward* as ſhe did, and as ſhe did get other ſervants to help; yet there is no doubt with me, but God would own and honor ſuch faithful miniſter, and a ſpecial inſtance of this kind has been in this country in my day, within the compaſs of my knowledge.

Mr. *Adams* page 81ſt, aſks what the difference is between a *legiſlative* and *executive* body? This I have told before, I ſuppoſe to the ſatisfaction of all, except Mr. *Adams* and his diſcerning *few*.

In the ſame page to make out that miniſters have a right to negative the votes of the church in compariſon with civil courts, he adduces (as I ſuppoſe it muſt be) the caſe of *Richardſon*, in which the court ſuſpended giving ſentence for a long time, to the general diſſatisfaction of the people, not only in this province, but likely throughout *America*, ſo far as it was known. And whether the court had a right to do that or not, I ſhall not pretend to ſay. However I think it was a precedent that cannot give us any better reliſh for his ſcheme, which he would build upon it: And abundantly ſhews that he is upon the high tory ſide of the queſtion, in civil, as well eccleſiaſtical affairs.

In the ſame page he ſpeaks of a miniſter's marrying any that according to law he ought not : That if he does, it is at his peril. Though there are many caſes wherein it is unlawful for perſons to marry ; yet I ſuppoſe that theſe two general points are to be obſerved. *Firſt*, that the perſons are publiſhed according to law. *Secondly*, that one or both the parties were publiſhed in his own town : Some particular inſtances excepted. And if he breaks over them rules, he does it at his peril. And I wiſh it were as perilous for miniſters to lead churches to act upon things not *publiſhed*, or properly notified, ſo that the church may know what and when they are to act upon any affairs ; or for miniſters to pretend to negative votes of the church out of his own town. If theſe things had been as perilous as marrying without publiſhing, &c. it is not likely we ſhould have had a certain church lead to vote noncommunion with *Bolton* church on a day, previous to the day publickly prefixed to conſider and act upon their letter. Nor a certain miniſter of another town undertake to negative the votes of *Bolton* church.

## OF THE KEYS.

Mr. *Adams* in his 32d page begins upon the *keys*. But I dont find that he has undertook to confute any thing in particular, I ſaid upon that, only that obout the XVIth of *Mat*. As to this he entirely diſapproves of the *argumentum ad hominem*, I brought to prove that we muſt interpret that in the XVIth of *Mat*. in conſiſtency with the XVIII. Mr. *Adams* ſeems very confident they were given to *Peter*. This is the very text that the *Pope* builds upon, that he is *Peter*'s ſucceſſor, and ſo he certainly has the *keys*. Mr. *Adams* is following of him as faſt as he can, we may ſee by his whole ſcheme ; however he ſeems willing at preſent, to go halves with the brotherhood, and allow they were given to them in the XVIIIth. This to be ſure is a fair ſhew ; and the brotherhood will no doubt be thought very unge-

nerous, if they will not allow him half, when the *Pope* has the whole.

However I ſhall ſay ſomething to ſhew, that the *keys* were not given to *Peter* in the XVIth of *Mat.* And if I can make that appear to the ſatisfaction of the public, I ſhall tumble Mr. *Adams* out of the holy chair.

Mr. *Adams* might with as much juſtice have pretended that the perſon of *Peter*, was the *rock* on which Chriſt would build his church, as to pretend that Chriſt gave the keys to the perſon of *Peter*; for thus Chriſt begins in the 18th verſe, *And I ſay unto thee that thou art* Peter, *and upon this* rock *I will build my church*, verſe 19th. *And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven*, &c.

Now *Peter* ſignifying a *rock*, for Chriſt then to ſay thou art a *rock*, and upon this *rock* I will build my church, muſt give as much, and more grounds to argue that the perſon of *Peter* was the *rock* on which Chriſt would build his church; than that he gave the *keys* to *Peter*; for what is ſaid about the *rock*, is ſpoken in the preſent tenſe. *Thou art Peter.* But that of the *keys*, in the future tenſe, *I will give*, &c. And take it ſo that the perſon of *Peter* is the *rock*, upon which Chriſt builds his church, and the *keys* given to him, and then we have at once *Peter* mounted in the holy chair, and Mr. *Adams* in his lap; at leaſt upon one knee, while he pretends to allow the church the other.

But as this conſtruction will not do, we muſt look for one more, conſiſtent with the general ſcheme of the goſpel, and the reaſon of things.

It is the opinion of ſundry authors, in all reſpects his ſuperiors, that the *rock* on which Chriſt in this place, ſays he will build his church, was the confeſſion *Peter* made, viz. *Thou art the Chriſt, the Son of the living God.* Not is *Peter* a rock, becauſe he had confeſſed it; for a rock is ſomething permanent and ſtable, which can never be moved, but *Peter* was unſtable, after all this profeſſion,

he denied Chriſt entirely, that he knew him, or any thing about him.

But this truth, that *Jeſus is the Chriſt the Son of the living God*, is as permanent, ſtable and unſhaken as God himſelf; and therefore the *rock* on which the church ſhould be built; for perſons believing, profeſſing and uniting in that truth, become Chriſt's church, impregnable by hell it ſelf. But to take it in the ſenſe that theſe things were ſpoken of the perſon of *Peter*, has made the moſt horried *hell gates* that ever were upon earth. Take it in this ſenſe that it was that truth which *Peter* confeſſed; this *rock* was already fixed, and pointed at by Chriſt, and therefore ſpeaks of the rock in the preſent tenſe, as now in being; and as *Peter* had juſt been confeſſing of it, he directs to him, what he determined concerning that confeſſion, that the church ſhould be built upon it, and ſhould have the keys; for although he ſays, *I will give the keys to thee*; yet it muſt mean, to all thoſe that ſhould make the ſame confeſſion, that *Peter* had, a thing in common to them all; or elſe *Peter* is mounted directly into the holy chair, and all other chriſtians, apoſtles and all, are his humble ſervants: for it can no more be extended to the other apoſtles, than to all other chriſtians whatever. The word THEE, thus ſpoken to *Peter* in the ſingular number, could no more contain *Andrew* and *James* and *Phillip*, &c. his fellow diſciples, than all other chriſtians of their day, which ſhould believe and make the ſame confeſſion he did. Nor could it any more contain *Zabdiel*, and *Timothy*, and *Ebenezer*, of the preſent clergy, than *Samuel* and *Ephraim* and *Nathaniel* of the laity. So that it muſt mean what Chriſt would give to that church he had been ſpeaking of, when built, or it means nothing at all to us; *Peter* had the promiſe of the *keys* to him, and it's likely he had what was promiſed him, and we have nothing to do about it.

But we may obſerve, that the *keys* were not actually given to *Peter*, nor any body elſe in this XVIth chapter of *Matt.* but *I will give*, referring to ſomething he would do afterward, which brings us to the XVIIIth for the interpretation, as the fulfilment of his promiſe in the XVIth, and as we find the apoſtles always practicing accordingly, in their epiſtles treating matters upon the plan of the power or *keys* being in the church, and Chriſt in his epiſtles to the ſeven churches, as I briefly conſidered before, which Mr. *Adams* has not pretended to diſprove; therefore we may fairly conclude, that what was ſaid in the XVIth of *Matt.* was upon the plan of the keys being given the church.

However, that Mr. *Adams* may ſee that I am not alone in this extraordinary expoſition, I will juſt quote a paſſage out of Mr. *Davenport* before mentioned, that Mr. *Adams* may have the pleaſure of *pointing the public finger at* ſome as much contrary to him as the Neighbour.

Mr. *Davenport*, page 86, ſpeaking of the XVIth of *Matthew* ſays, "In verſe 19 he giveth unto *Peter* upon occaſion of his public confeſſion, in the name of the church, a promiſe of *the keys of the kingdom of heaven.* Therefore this promiſe is given to the church in *Peter.*—The power itſelf of the keys, is here originally and primarily committed to the *church in general*, exiſting in particular churches. I might produce ſundry writers, both ancient and modern, of other countries, and our own, if need required, to confirm this expoſition." He goes on for two or three pages, to enumerate ſeveral authors, and ſome that had been put to death for holding to this expoſition of the text, and quotes ſome authors as far back as *Anno* 200, 250, and 400. And in his 88th page ſays, "ſo that this is no new, or ſingular expoſition of theſe words, or practice taken up by ſome few of late." Thus I truſt I have for the preſent ſufficiently ſhewn that the *keys* were by Chriſt originally committed to the church.

Mr. *Adams* in his 86th page, highly threatens, as he had before done in his ſermon, that few or no miniſters will ſettle upon any other plan than his; or indeed even give up their places before they will give up his ſcheme. But I hope none will be frighted at this. The queſtion is not whether we can get miniſters upon this or that plan; but what is the true ſcriptural plan. And if we cannot get miniſters to ſettle upon that, we had as good be without them as with them.

I ſhall now conclude this part of the work, by ſetting down a catalogue of ſome of Mr. *Adams*'s moſt groſs *Inconſiſtencies*, and of things that appear to me *Untruths*, that the reader may have a more ſhort and eaſy view of them.

Firſt—Of his INCONSISTENCIES.

1ſt. Mr. *Adams* in his 36th page ſays that councils have no *juridical* power. And yet his book is full of ſaying councils are *judges*, conſtituted judges, &c.

2d. In the 54th page——Councils have no coercive power to enforce their judgments, determinations or reſults. And yet the ſame page——They are to withdraw communion from the church that don't obey them—and in the 56th page—the civil court muſt enforce the reſult, or they ſubvert the conſtitution.

3d. He ſays if the brotherhood claims an excluſive right of judging and condemning their own elders, it deſtroys the conſtitution, page 57. And yet page 43 and 47—Every individual church has an *excluſive* right and power to call, diſmiſs or depoſe it's officers; is the fountain of all eccleſiaſtical power; has full and ſufficient power to do every thing neceſſary to it's preſervation. This laſt he mentions indeed as from the platform, and as his own ſentiments. But I muſt obſerve one query here.

QUERY. IF churches have ſuch an excluſive right as he tells of: Pray why dont it *exclude* councils from being ſuch *judges* as he tells of ? ! !

4th. He ſays *Bolton* church knew that the neighbouring miniſters and churches were, or ought to be out of charity with them, that they had the ſtrongeſt reaſon in the world to conclude ſo, page 63d. And yet that their applying to thoſe churches, was to diſturb their peace, and to ſet them and their miniſters at odds.

QUERY. If they knew both miniſters and churches were out of charity; how could this ſet them at odds? !!

5th. He ſays the weapons of councils are only ſpiritual, which therefore muſt mean, that they are binding only on the conſcience, page 36. And yet page 52d, &c.—Conſcience muſt not be bound by the reſult, but the miniſter muſt have his ſalary.

6th. He ſays the people themſelves are the ſole judges whether the determinations of councils are ſcriptural, page 54th. And yet the whole ſcheme of this book and his ſermon too, is to blame *Bolton* people very highly for not accepting the reſults of councils.

Secondly—Of his UNTRUTHS.

1ſt. Speaking of *Bolton* people, page 30, ſays, The ſtrongeſt part, violently diſpoſſeſſed the others of the houſe they uſed to congregate in. When I preſume they never kept one perſon out of the meeting-houſe, not even Mr. *Goſs* himſelf.

2d. He ſays that I ſay, we are bound to follow and continue with a multitude, whether it does well or ill, page 31ſt. But I never ſaid any ſuch thing.

3d. In ſaying page 37th, and other places that I declared, that no man is intereſted in any cauſe unleſs he wins or loſes money. When I never ſaid any ſuch thing.

4th. In pretending page 41ſt, that I endeavered to make the public believe, that certain words he quoted out of the PLATFORM in his ſermon, were merely his own. When I declared that he quoted the words right; and Mr. *Adams* owns too, that I ſaid he quoted them right. So

that here is an inconſiſtency, as well as falacy, and there are two or three more falacies about it down the ſame page.

5th. In pretending page 44th, that the reſults of councils are never carried into effect, without the act or votes of the church. When he and the neighbouring miniſters, have been ſo ſtrenuouſly carrying into effect the *Bolton* reſult againſt the people there, not only without, but againſt the votes of that church, and their own churches too. And the whole tenor of his book, is, that if a church dont accept of a reſult, other churches muſt be out of charity or fellowſhip with it, &c. So that here again is an inconſiſtency as well as falacy.

6th. In pretending page 73d, that there is ſcarcely an orderly church in this part of the world, will have any thing to do with *Bolton* church. When there is ſcarce a church whoſe minds have been fairly tried, but what have ſignified they were in charity with them.

7th. In his 61ſt page, ſpeaking of my 13th page, where I had quoted platform, chapter XV. § 2d. He ſays, that "All the platform ſays in that chapter and ſect. is, that churches exerciſe communion ſundry ways."

When there is full three pages in that ſection, in which were words expreſsly to my purpoſe.

Thus I have hinted ſome of his moſt groſs falacies, as they appear to me; the reader will ſee how far he was from taking that care he promiſed, to advance nothing but what was ſtrictly true.

Having thus as I truſt deterged the moſt of Mr. *Adams's acrimony*, I hope the wound may be in a good way to be healed, after I have applied ſome ſuitable emollients and proper bandages, which may be the ſubject of the 3d part of this work; to which I proceed.

# PART III.

AS the powers of the church and people, with reſpect to calling and diſmiſſing or depoſing their officers, eſpecially miniſters ; and the power of a church with relation to their miniſter, in their ſocial acts, are ſo much the ſubject of debate, and the cardinal points in the preſent controverſy, I ſhall offer a few words more diſtinct from any ſpecial reply to Mr. *Adams*'s anſwer to my former Treatiſe.

1ſt. That the people, have from God, a plenary and excluſive right and authority, to chooſe and diſmiſs or depoſe their own officers.

I ſhall endeavor to confirm this from God's word, by proving the following poſition, viz.

*That God ever owned people in their chooſing and depoſing their own officers.*

GOD made man a rational creature, and treats him as ſuch ; and though man has fallen and loſt the moral image of God ; yet God has reſerved to the man, the powers of reaſon and underſtanding, to direct and govern himſelf, as to the things of this world, and to chriſtians, the influences of his ſpirit, by his word, to guide them as to the things of the other world : And whether we conſider them as men, or as chriſtians, each one has the gift of God, whereby in the proper exerciſe of it, he is capable of chooſing for himſelf, no other being dignified or impowered to chooſe for him. And even God himſelf having conferred thoſe gifts upon man, does not interpoſe ſo as to take away the liberty or freedom of the man ; and particularly this point of chooſing and depoſing officers, is by God in his word, treated moſt tenderly.

Accordingly in the ſtate of *Iſrael* which is univerſally called a *Theocracy*, viz. God the King. The officers were choſen by the people.

This was the ſenſe, that *God* and *Moſes* treated the affair, when God at firſt ſet up the *Theocratical* government over them, in appointing *Moſes* for their captain and leader. In the IIId chapter of *Exod.* God tells *Moſes* what he ſhould ſay unto the people, and in the 18th verſe ſays, *They ſhall hearken to thy voice.* *Moſes* in the 1ſt verſe of the next chapter ſcruples whether they would. Then God tells him what he ſhould do before them, to make them believe and hearken; and finally in the 31ſt verſe, we find *the people believed.* Here we find God firſt nominated *Moſes* for the chief officer of his people; and ſends him to the people, for their election, i. e. to *believe* and *hearken*, which amounts to the ſame thing; God indeed ſays, they ſhall *chooſe* or *hearken.* But then it was by means, and evidence ſet before them, which God was able to do, ſo as to induce them freely to chooſe *Moſes* as their captain, or chief officer; they were not to be compelled by military force, or by plagues to be ſent upon them, to enforce them to accept of *Moſes*; yea though God appointed him himſelf, and it was by the moſt immediate and expreſs ordinance of God; yet there was no ſcheme in it to leave the people in a ſtate of independency, as Mr. *Adams* tells of, if they do not accept the reſult of councils, this was not God's way. If he had ordered *Moſes* to go and tell the people ſo and ſo, and if they won't hearken to you, then leave them, and I will ſend my plagues upon them inſtead of *Egypt*; Mr. *Adams*'s ſcheme would have had ſomething like a precedent. But far from that; light, evidence and means were to be ſet before them, till they voluntarily chooſe, and then after that, *Moſes*, as the chief officer of *Iſrael* went to *Pharoah* to negotiate their departure, &c.

Upon the ſame plan we find *Moſes* went on, for when he went to put in ſubordinate officers, he put it to the people to chooſe them. See *Deut.* I. 13. *Take ye wiſe men and underſtanding and known among your tribes.* This is

too plain that they were to be choſen by the people, to admit of any comment to illuſtrate it. The ſame might be obſerved in many inſtances, or fairly argued; but I ſhall only touch upon ſome that are moſt plain. We may obſerve, that when Iſrael came to have kings over them, they came in by the ſuffrage of the people. Thus *Saul*, though he was anointed by the ſpecial direction of God, yet he did not take or meddle with the kingdom till he had the ſuffrage of the people. 1 *Sam.* X. 24. *And all the people ſhouted and ſaid, God ſave the king.* There was a free ſuffrage or choice. But there were ſome out-ſtanding, which, with the victory they gained, occaſioned their renewing the kingdom, in the ſame, or a more explicit manner, by the ſuffrage or choice of the people, chapter XI. 15. *All the people went to Gilgal, and there they made* Saul *king before the Lord.* His being before the Lord, ſhews that God owned them, in *their* doing of it. Next we may obſerve concerning *David*, he was anointed king by God's ſpecial direction many years before he reigned; and he never did reign at all, till he was made king by the people. See 2 *Sam.* II. 4. *The men of Judah anointed David king over the houſe of Judah.* Chapter V. 1 and 3. *All the tribes of Iſrael came to David—and they anointed David king over Iſrael.* Here we may ſee, the right and power of depoſing, as well as electing, judging and executing: for in this they depoſed the houſe of *Saul*, which they had before repeatedly choſe. And I ſuppoſe no body will diſpute, but God owned the people in this revolution. We have alſo a very explicit account of the ſame in 1 *Chron.* XIth and XIIth chapters.

The ſame might be obſerved both of election and depoſition, as to the affair of *Rehoboam*. And this Mr. *Adams* himſelf has adduced as a right in the people to depoſe; but then he ſeems to ſuggeſt it, as though it was becauſe they had a council, and *Rehoboam* would not hearken to that, and therefore the people had a right.

But then Mr. *Adams* ſhould have remembered, the council he ſpeaks of, which *Rehoboam* forſook, were ſome of the aged leading men of his own people, and he did follow the advice of a council of ſuch as were brought up with him, likely ſome that were in college with him, and I ſuſpect Mr. *Goſs*'s misfortune happened the ſame way. For there is no doubt with me, but that if Mr. *Goſs* would have been adviſed by ſome of the old leading men among his own people, inſtead of following the counſel of thoſe that were brought up with him, and perhaps ſome younger, he might have continued quiet and comfortable in the miniſtry there to this day. We may juſt obſerve, that many of the revolutions of the kings of Iſrael, fairly hold forth the point we are upon. *Jezebel* upbraided *Jehu* with acting unconſtitutionally, as Mr. *Adams* does *Bolton*; and ſhe compares him to *Zimri*. But ſhe was wrong about that; for *Jehu* was choſe by the ſuffrage of the people, and *Zimri* was not; he uſurped, and the people choſe *Omri* king, and he coming in conſtitutionally, might have continued, and his poſterity time out of mind, for ought appears, if it had not been for their ſins, after they were promoted.

We may now obſerve briefly, that the apoſtles practiſed putting in officers by election. I. An apoſtle. II. Deacons III. Elders. That in *Acts* XIV. 23d, ſpeaking of ordaining *elders* in every church by the beſt criticks, ought to have been tranſlated, *When they had with lifting up of hands, choſen elders in every church.* I do not remember any particular account we have in the new teſtament, of depoſing any church officers, except that in the IId chapter of *Rev.* where Chriſt ſpeaking to the church of *Epheſus* commends them, that they could not bear them which are evil; and had tried them which ſay they are apoſtles, and are not, and had found them liars. For though it does not expreſsly ſay they had depoſed them, or turned them away; yet we muſt rationally ſuppoſe they did:

For it would have been nothing commendable to have found them liars, and kept them after that ; but really worſe, and then it ſays they could not bear them. But he have no account of any *mutual council* they had to *try* them : The church *tried* them themſelves, and found them guilty ; ſo that here we may ſee Chriſt approves of the churches *judging* delinquent elders or church officers, though Mr. *Adams* does not.

And upon the whole, I truſt it ſufficiently appears, that through the whole of the ſcriptures, both old-teſtament and new, that God approves of, and owns his people in their exerciſing this authority of chooſing and removing their own officers, both in church and ſtate. To this purpoſe Mr. *Turner* in his election ſermon the preſent year ſays, " That ſervants of the public ſhould not be reſponſible to the public, is popery, either in religion or politicks," page 30. And it may be worthy of remark, that God in his providence, ſo far as hiſtory and our own obſervation will ſerve us, always has ſpecially owned a people in the exerciſe of that power and privilege ; enlargeing, encreaſing and enriching of them. But when their rulers become tyrannical, and the people neglect or ſupinely looſe their privileges, every thing goes to decay, is and ſoon ſucceeded with very great, if not utter deſtruction. Witneſs many things in our own nation as well as others. Therefore it appears both by God's word and providences, that the power and authority of *electing* and *removing* all officers, ought to be ſolely in the people, for whom they are made, without any embarraſment whatſoever.

2dly. I ſhall ſay ſomething as to the churches power with relation to their miniſter in their ſocial acts.

This is ſpecially as to the *negative power* which Mr. *Adams* is ſo tenacious of. I intended to have ſaid ſomething particularly from ſcripture, ſhewing that on ſuch

power does or can belong to the miniſter. But as I am in haſte on my journey, and as I have ſufficiently anſwered what Mr. *Adams* pretended to bring from ſcripture, and ſhewn that it is nothing to his purpoſe, I ſhall omit that for the preſent ; and only obſerve, That the very practice of miniſters and churches, confounds their having a negative upon the church.

For miniſters, or if they have ruling elders along with them, to have a negative upon the brotherhood, they muſt be a diſtinct branch, and act in diſtinct and ſeparate bodies or branches, and then the miniſter or elderſhip cannot have the moderatorſhip of the brotherhood, according to any acting bodies whatſoever ; nor according to reaſon and the nature of things. The king is not preſident or moderator of the houſe of Lords ; nor the governor of this province preſident of the council, in legiſlative proceedings, where he is a diſtinct branch. But the governor in *Connecticut* not being a diſtinct branch, is always preſident, or as moderator of the council. But in no body, formed for action that I know of, is there a negative at the head of it. The preſident of the council, the ſpeaker of the houſe, the moderator of meetings, town or pariſh, do not have a negative, nor any thing like it ; and for a ſocial body for action to have ſuch a negative at the head of it, to me looks as abſurd, incompatible and ridiculous, as it would be to ſee a natural body with it's *head on, face backward* ; that would be a proper *negative* head, and when the body aſſayed to move or act, the head would tend tother way, and deſtroy all action. They would have a mutual check upon each other, as Mr. *Adams* tells of ; and it would be a wonderful creature indeed ; juſt ſuch kind of creatures are thoſe churches whoſe miniſters are negativers, and at the ſame time moderators. But moderators of ſocial bodies are to keep orders, to collect and declare the acts of the body, and are neceſſarily of the ſame unmixed body, and muſt move with the body, or

the acts of the body can never be effected or obtained. Therefore for miniſters to be moderators of church meetings, is incompatible with, and confounds the very notion of their having a negative.

I ſhall now add a few words of conſolation to my *patient*, and then conclude.

Although ſuch wounds are very grievous and hard to bear; yet I hope it will work for your good, and that by this means you will be prevented purſuing your journey from *Jeruſalem* to *Jericho*, that accurſed city, whoſe walls have once been thrown down by the ſounding of the goſpel trumpets; but has been built again by *Hiel* the *Bethelite*, ſee 1 *King*. XVI. 34. *Hiel* ſignifies *God lives*, or the *life of God*, and *Bethel*, the *houſe of God*; ſo that in ſhort *Hiel* the *Bethelite*, is one of a ſacred name and habitation, who has laid the foundation in *Abiram* his firſt born, which by interpretation is, *a high father*, or *father of fraud*; and has ſet up the gates thereof, in his youngeſt ſon *Segub*, which means *fortified* or *raiſed*. I ſcarce need to add any more to make it moſt plain and familiar, that the rebuilding of *Jericho*, the accurſed city, with the names of the builder, the foundation and gates, appear eminently to point forth the building up of eccleſiaſtical tyranny. For that tyranny, has ever more been built up, by ſuch as have ſuſtained ſacred names, poſſeſſing the moſt important places in the houſe of God, which according to interpretation is *Hiel* the *Bethelite*. And the foundation of that tyranny conſiſts in the elders or fathers of the church exalting themſelves high, and becoming *high fathers*, by fraud, guile and cozening the church out of her rights; which according to interpretation is *Abiram*. And the gates are ſet up in *Segub*; for when they have thus *fortified* or *raiſed* themſelves, none may go in or out but by them, either the miniſtry or church; they ſet themſelves up to be the gates or the doors of the church; claiming a negative on all church acts, and pretending to ſtop any from preach-

ing the poſpel, where they have taken an affront, and think proper to ſhut the gates, or rather fix themſelves, as the gates ſhut againſt any ones going in to preach, or the people going out, to partake of goſpel ordinances, as you may ſee in Mr. *Goſs*'s Narrative, one gate of four rails, and ſeveral more tucked under page 23d ; another gate of ſeven rails, page 25th, all which mightily anſwers to the interpretation of *Segub*.

Thus my patient, you have the accurſed city *Jeircoh*, to which you was going, deſcribed to you, it's *builder*, *foundation* and gates. I hope you will take the hint, and return back to the city *Jeruſalem*, which by the intepretation, is the city of *peace where God is ſeen* ; whoſe *edificer*, *foundation* and *gates*, are grace, truth and liberty ; whoſe king is righteouſneſs ; whoſe laws are love, and whoſe inhabitants are happy. And my earneſt deſire, prayer, and hope is, that we ſhall meet in the *New-Jeruſalem* above, which is free, and is mother of all true ſons of liberty.

You are ſenſible I have omitted many things which I intended to have done ; and there were many more which I have not hinted at above, which I muſt omit, having been detained ſo long, with cleanſing away Mr. *Adams*'s *acrimony*. I muſt now paſs on my journey homeward ; but I determine (if providence permit) to viſit you again ; I have a conſiderable patrimony, of which you ſee I have expended ſome already for you ; and I will not ſpare to diſburſt, even of that or my own earnings, to the intent you may be throughly healed.

# APPENDIX.

AFTER I had paſſed on my journey, I lit on a book intitled, " OBSERVATIONS upon the congregational plan of CHURCH GOVERNMENT, &c. — pretended to be " unanimouſly offered to the conſideration of the CHURCHES, by the CONVENTION of the MINISTERS of the province of the *Maſſachuſetts-Bay*, at their annual meeting in *Boſton*, *May* 26, 1773 : and continued by adjournment to *July* 23d.

This piece is evidently deſigned to eſpouſe the ſame cauſe that Mr. *Adams* has, and no doubt occaſioned by the ſame affair, viz. *Bolton* proceedings. If this then ſhould be conſidered, a fungous, or proud fleſh, riſen up round the ſore, it will require the application of cauſtick and abſtergent remedies, to purge away ſuch riſings as obſtruct the healing of the wound. Be it what it will, it was no doubt thought, that the name of the *Convention*, would add weight to the performance. Mr. *Adams* complains very bitterly of me, for not affixing my name to my *Treatiſe* ; and behold, here is a piece, upon the ſame cauſe he has ſo ſtrenuouſly eſpouſed, and no name, it pretends indeed to be by a certain body of men ; even the whole body of the *miniſters*, of the *Maſſachuſetts* province. But I can't light on one miniſter of that province that will own he was there. I ſuppoſe there are between three and four hundred miniſters of that province; and by all I can learn, there were but about fifty perſons preſent when this remarkable production took birth ; and they not unanimous as pretended neither. But obſerve, here is a pretended production of a body of men, and no *moderator*.

I ſuppoſe it is an unvariable rule, that when any vote, reſult or production, proceeds from a body of men, it is at leaſt atteſted or ſigned by the head, chairman, ſpeaker, clerk or moderator of ſuch body. But here is not ſo much as a *moderator*. Why truely it is likely there was no *moderator*; it was no moderate piece of work they were about. I can think of nothing, who or what ſet of men they were, unleſs the *thieves* that ſtript, plundered and wounded the man in the parable; and *thieves* I ſuppoſe do not have a *moderator*. So then, we have found out the myſtery of there being no *moderator*. And if we conſider two things, we ſhall find, that this was truely the caſe; they were upon the buſineſs of plundering the churches of their *rights*, *liberties* and *privileges*; and ſtole the name of the whole body of miniſters in the province, to give weight to what they did.

But where were theſe LIBERTY plunderers? Why they ſay, at BOSTON!! Is BOSTON, that metropolis of LIBERTY, that firſt momentum of LIBERTY, for this many years paſt, become a den of LIBERTY plunderers?! O BOSTON, will you exert yourſelves ſo againſt m-n-ſtry, p-rl-m-nt, g-v-rn-rs, &c. for your civil *liberties*; and yet ſuffer your religious *liberties*, which ſolely moved your fathers to come over into this land; will you ſuffer that moſt ſacred birthright to be ſacked by thoſe in your own bowels? I hope better things of you, and that e'er this time, you have ſent a *hue and cry* after them; ſomething muſt be done; if the churches do not rouſe up and proteſt againſt it, in leſs than half a century, it will be urged as of great authority; as being a fundamental book of the conſtitution. Without any prophetical ſpirit, I eaſily perceive, that in leſs than forty, nay thirty years (if there is nothing done) that convention *pamphlet* will be drawn into authority thus: "There were our fathers of that ſentiment, they viewed the conſtitution in that

light; nay however it might be some what doubtful, and uncertain before that day; yet it was fairly established then; for there were the whole body of *ministers of the province, unanimously offered it to the consideration of the* CHURCHES, and there was no objection against it; the *churches* acquiesced in it, at least it was a *silential vote*, and it appears by the book it self, there were at that time great disputes about them things, and whatever they were, yet all ministers and *churches* coalesced in this, if it had not been agreable to the mind of the *churches*, surely they would have said some thing against it: But nothing did the *churches* do against it, and therefore for any one to rise up against it now, so many years after, he makes himself wiser than all the fathers, both minister and people: Nay for any church now to break over that rule, she is schismatical, and departs from the God of her fathers."

Extract from the debates in council in the year 1799.

And will you, O ye CHURCHES of *New-England*, lie still and suffer things to go on so? *O tempora! O mores! Senatus haec intelligit, consul videt: hic tamen vivit, vivit? Imò verò etiam in senatum venit: fit publici concilii particeps: notat & designat oculis ad caedem unumquemque nostrûm. Nos autem viri fortes satisfacere reipublicae, videmur, si istius furorem ac tela vitemus. Ad mortem te, Catilina, duci jussu consulis jampridem oportebat: in te conferri pestem istam, quam in nos omnes jamdiu machinaris.------Non deest reipublicae consilium, neque auctoritas hujus ordinis: nos, nos, dico apertè consules desumus.* Tul. Cic. in Catalinam I.

I shall take the liberty, to give the above a free translation, adapted to the present affair. In which *Cataline*, as he was said to have contrived the overthrow of the state, may be translated the *pamphlet*; the *senate*, ecclesiastical *councils*; the *consuls*, the churches.

And then the tranſlation will ſtand thus :

Alas the times, what paſs things are got to ! The councils perceive, and the churches ſee it ; and yet it lives, lives did I ſay ? Nay indeed it comes into our public *councils*, and has a ſhare in their deciſions : it marks out every one of us (at leaſt our liberties) to the ſlaughter. And yet we brave men (who have ſo long been reſolving upon *liberty*) flatter ourſelves, that we do our duty to the public (and poſterity) if we can eſcape it's fury and weapons. You ought, O *pamphlet*, long ſince to have been put to death by the order of the churches ; to bring upon you that vengeance which you have ſo long been meditating againſt us all.------There is no *want* in the conſtitution, no *want* of authority and power in the churches. We, we, I ſpeak it to our ſhame, we *churches* are *wanting*. Wanting in doing our duty and beſtiring ourſelves ; I ſpeak in behalf of the churches, in imitation of *Cicero*, and as he did, to ſtir up the churches to look about them to ſee what their rights, liberties and privileges are, to aſſert and maintain them againſt all invaſions ; and hand them down inviolate to poſterity.

But perhaps it will be expected that I ſay ſomething by way of confutation of this extraordinary production. But I truſt that what I have ſaid in reply to M^r. *Adams* may ſerve as an anſwer, or remarks upon this, it being really no more than ſaying his words over after him ; ſaveing only that it pretends to adduce the fathers to vindicate it. But I have hinted ſomething from them, which may ſhew that the fathers are really on my ſide, and I could offer much more from them to the ſame purpoſe if need required. But I have I truſt ſhewn, to the ſatisfaction of the public, from the *word of God*, that the right and power of chooſing and depoſing officers, lies with the people, which muſt be received, let the fathers be as they will. However, if I ſhould have occaſion to write again, the public ſhall hear farther from the *fathers*.

I will juſt make one *remark* and conclude.

Mr. *Adams* and the pamphlet lay great ſtreſs upon the parentheſis in the 6th ſection of the 10th chapter of the platform; where ſpeaking of the power of the church to remove incorrigible elders, ſays, " as the church had power to call to office, ſo they have power according to order (the council of other churches where it may be had, directing thereto) to remove him from his office," &c. The *pamphlet* has the impudence to put the parentheſis, and two or three words before it, in a different character, as if there were ſome ſpecial ſtreſs to be laid upon them words above all the reſt. But this there was no authority from the fathers to do, which every one may ſee, by looking into the platform, and if it tries to cheat ſo, in that which is in almoſt every ones power to detect; how much more, may we reaſonably ſuſpect them in their quotations from the fathers, which few have the opportunity to ſee.

Upon the whole, Mr. *Adams* and the pamphlet are ſo ſet upon the *parentheſis*, we may go according to the expreſs letter of that, and I gueſs it won't pleaſe them any better than what *Bolton* have done. Obſerve the words are, " (the council of other churches," &c.) not a council of *miniſters*, nor *miniſters* and *churches*; and to reckon *miniſters* and *churches*, diſtinct branches one from another, as Mr. *Adams* and thoſe upon his plan do. *The council of other churches* mentioned in the platform, cannot have any *miniſters* in it; and the thing is eaſily enough effected, let them vary the *letters miſſive* a little from the common form, inſtead of *deſiring the preſence and aſſiſtance* of the church by their *Rev. elder, and ſuch other meſſengers as they ſhall think proper*, &c. Let it be worded thus, " We deſire your preſence and aſſiſtance, by ſuch meſſengers as you ſhall think proper to ſend." This Mr. *Wiſe* has ſhewn is according to the churches right;

and if the church don't think proper to ſend the miniſter he will have no right in council ; but be it as it will, as to what Mr. *Wiſe* ſays ; according to the notion of the miniſters being a diſtinct branch from the church, he has no right to be in the council, claimed by the *parentheſis* ; for that is to be a council of CHURCHES ; and this I have no doubt would many times more likely do juſtice, than ſuch as are convened ; and if the miniſter won't join to call ſuch a council, then *the council of other churches can't be had*, and the church are clear according to the ſcheme, and eſpecially according to Mr. *Adams* ; ſee his ſermon, page 35th. *If the miniſter refuſes to join*, then may they diſmiſs him without a council.

However, though I think this might mend the matter, I am not for having the church hampered, or embarreſſed, even with ſuch a council as that ; but that the church ſhould ſtill be left free to act, as ſhe ſhall find to be duty, notwithſtanding any council whatever. And upon them terms, I would have churches upon all important affairs, ſend for council, ſuch as they ſhall judge are moſt likely to underſtand and diſpoſed to help them. And when they have done, follow their advice ſo far as they can with a good conſcience ; or as far as they find it agreable to the *word of God* ; and this is agreable to what I ſaid in my former *Treatiſe*. Thus I ſuppoſe I have wrote ſufficiently for the preſent : And being alſo in haſte, I ſubſcribe myſelf a well-wiſher to all, both miniſters and people, and their hearty friend,

A NEIGHBOUR.

*Auguſt* 12th, 1773.

# TESTIMONIES.

WHEREAS Mr. *Goſs* has publiſhed a Narrative in anſwer to the *Neighbour*'s Narrative, in which Mr. *Goſs* has advanced many things not genuine. We therefore publiſh the following Teſtimonies, that the public may have a view of the true ſtate of ſome things wherein Mr. *Goſs*'s Narrative is erroneous.

In the beginning of Mr. *Goſs*'s Narrative, he denies that he "inſiſted on his innocence, before both the church and council."

WE the ſubſcribers well remember, and are ready to give oath (if called to it) that we heard Mr. *Goſs* declare in the church meeting, "That he never had drank *to that degree, ſo as in any way to affect or hurt his reaſon, ſpeech or limbs*;" and alſo heard him ſay the ſame at other times.

EPHRAIM FAIRBANK,
ELIAKIM ATHERTON.

*Bolton, Aug.* 3d, 1773.

And as to his inſiſting on his innocence before the council for the proof thereof, we appeal to ſome that were members of that council, and other gentlemen that were preſent as ſpectators, ſo me of whom we have heard ſay, they were ready to teſtify to the truth of it, if required.

As to Mr. *Goſs*'s denying, that he read his declaration intermixed with his ſermon, page 7: We the ſubſcribers teſtify, and are ready to give oath, that we well remember that Mr. *Goſs* delivered ſaid declaration after he had read his text, and made an introduction to his ſermon; and we have heard many others ſay they remember the ſame; and it was ſo interwoven into his ſermon, that ſome who had before heard

ſaid declaration, and ſome who had not before heard it, we have heard declare they did not miſtruſt in the time of it, that any ſuch thing had been offered.

NATHANIEL LONGLEY,
SAMUEL JONES.

*Bolton, Aug.* 3d, 1773.

As to what Mr. *Goſs* ſays page 8th, to exculpate himſelf for leaving a falſe copy of the declaration with the deacon, the *church* at firſt agreed to ſettle with him. We the ſubſcribers, members of the church in *Bolton*, hereby declare, that we well remember, that the church agreed to ſettle with him upon condition that he would read ſaid declaration to the congregation the next Lord's day.; and leave a copy of it with the oldeſt deacon. But according to Mr. *Goſs*'s own account, he never did leave a copy of it ; that Mr. *Harrington* drew what he did leave with the deacon ; and that he knew when he left it, it was not a true copy of what the church agreed to ſettle with him upon ; and therefore it appears by Mr. *Goſs*'s own account, that he never has ſettled with the church for the very firſt complaint againſt him ; ſince he never has fulfilled the conditions agreed upon for a ſettlement at that time.

NATHANIEL LONGLEY,
EPHRAIM FAIRBANK.

*Bolton, Aug.* 3d, 1773.

As to what Mr. *Goſs* ſays in the laſt paragraph of the 9th page, to make out that he had not ſhewn a paper to the former council, which he promiſed he would not ; he owns that he had promiſed, that he would not lay ſaid paper before the firſt council, and we the ſubſcribers well remember, and can ſafely give oath (if required) that we heard Mr. *Goſs* ſay, that ſaid firſt council, judged ſaid paper to be equal to his confeſſion, made at that council ;

and we are very certain ſaid council could know nothing about ſaid paper, unleſs he had ſhewn it to them.

ROBERT LONGLEY,
PAUL WHETCOMB.

*Bolton, Aug.* 3d, 1773.

As to what Mr. *Goſs* ſays, in the 10th page, about the complaint which roſe up in view in the time of the ſitting of the ſecond council: That it was the third thing that was offered, after Mr. *Ephraim Fairbank*, who was one of the committee, for laying the complaints before the council, had declared that all was given in. We the ſubſcribers remember that at ſaid council there was one or two papers, offered to the council, for ſupport of the *complaints* after the *complaints* were given in. But ſaid papers were thrown out bythe council: Which was always looked upon as a grievance.—And we would alſo obſerve, that though Mr. *Goſs* ſeems here to inſinuate, as though Mr. *Fairbank* had offered two or three *complaints* after he had ſaid all *complaints* were given in; yet Mr. *Goſs* himſelf don't preſume to ſay, this was the third *complaint*; but the third *thing*. Now there was but one *complaint*, and that was verbally made againſt Mr. *Goſs*, for making a falſe declaration before ſaid council.

JOHN WHETCOMB,
JOHN PIERCE.

*Bolton, Aug.* 3d, 1773.

In the 11th page Mr. *Goſs* inſinuates as though I had given under my hand two accounts of certain converſations materially different. I look upon ſuch blind ſuggeſtions of duplicity of conduct, without ſhewing what the two accounts are, which he pretends are ſo different, highly ſlanderous and reproachful, and I truſt the public will look upon ſuch inſinuations in their own nature falſe, where the facts are not expreſſed, ſo that they may be traverſed.

JOHN WHETCOMB.

*Bolton, Aug.* 3d, 1773.

As to what Mr. *Goſs* ſays, in the 11th and 12th pages, pretending to make out his veracity againſt the complaint of his diſpenſing with his own promiſes—by alledging that his promiſe in that caſe was conditional: We the ſubſcribers know and well remember, that it appeared to the church that Mr. *Goſs*'s promiſe in that caſe, was *abſolute*, and that it could not be conditional as he pretends; for the paper was not in the Colonel's power, which he pretends he was to have a copy of, as a conſideration for the copy he promiſed the Col. and the Col. was heard to tell Mr. *Goſs* that he never promiſed him any ſuch thing; nor ſhould he procure it for him. And we alſo know, that the account of that affair, as it is in the Neighbour, page 5th, is genuine; which indeed Mr. *Goſs* himſelf has not preſumed to deny.

NATHANIEL LONGLEY,
SILAS BAILEY.

*Bolton, Aug.* 3d, 1773.

In the 13th page Mr. *Goſs* aſſerts, that he non-concurred certain votes of the church in the time of the meeting, and that it was proved ſo to the council.

We the ſubſcribers teſtify, that being preſent at all of ſaid meetings, never knew of any ſuch thing in the time of the meetings; nor can we learn that any one member of the church ever did, or any one elſe: Neither had the church any intimation of it, as we can learn, for above a month after the laſt of ſaid meetings.

ROBERT LONGLEY,
SILAS BAILEY.

*Bolton, Aug.* 3d, 1773.

In the 14th page Mr. *Goſs* undertakes to give an account of three church meetings; the firſt of which he ſays was appointed but for half a day, and continued ſo that the mind of the church was taken once, if not oftner by voices.

We the ſubſcribers, being members of the church, and preſent at all ſaid meetings, declare that we know of no

vote put to be tried by voices; and to be ſure that there was no vote paſſed ſo, or any other way the firſt day, only to adjourn the meeting; we have Mr. *Goſs*'s own words for it, a few lines onward, where, at the cloſe of the 3d and laſt meeting, he ſays, "during this time we had not ſettled one article, but really increaſed their number."

JOHN PIERCE,
SIMON WHETCOMB.

*Bolton Aug.* 3d, 1773.

As to what Mr. *Goſs* ſays in the 16th page and onward under his head of *meaſures taken to ſtir up ſtrife*: Particularly as to the protraction of terms for bringing in allegations. It was purely out of tenderneſs to Mr. *Goſs*. For after Mr. *Goſs*'s pretended making ſatisfaction, for what appeared on communion day; one of the congregation, being diſſatisfed, openly declared, that Mr. *Goſs* had been *groggy ten times*, for which Mr. *Goſs* talked of taking him in the law. But the church tho't it would be better for Mr. *Goſs*, to endeavour to ſettle theſe things among ourſelves; and ſo all poſſible forbearance was uſed, that if by any means, things might not by haſtineſs be done to extremity.

And as to what he ſays about the *town*'s being called together, a committee choſe, and Col. *Whetcomb* at the head of it; repreſenting as tho' the Col. was unfriendly at that time. There was indeed a part of the inhabitants of the town came together, but not as a town-meeting, as Mr. *Goſs* inſinuates. But the buſineſs of that meeting was purely out of concern for Mr. *Goſs*, and the diſſatisfaction prevailing againſt him; and the Col. then endeavouring to maintain Mr. *Goſs*'s character and ſtanding, did what he could that all aggrievances ſhould be brought, that there might be a ſettlement.

Mr. *Goſs* in the 18th page, begins a long account of what he intitles *meaſures purſued for the continuance of*

*ſtrife*, which is very far from being genuine, an d though there are very many unjuſt aſperſions on the church and town, and eſpecially upon ſome particular perſons who held out long in favour of him, hoping that he was not incorigible, but at laſt were conſtrained to deſert him or their own conſciences ; yet we ſhall not follow him in all his particulars to contradict him, where he deſerves it, but ſhall give a ſhort and juſt account of *meaſures* purſued by Mr. *Goſs*, to make, continue and increaſe diſſatisfaction, ſtrife and diviſion.

The firſt thing to make and continue diſſatisfaction, ſtrife aud diviſion, was Mr. *Goſs*'s reading his declaration in ſuch a promiſcuous manner with his ſermon.

2d. When he had promiſed to leave a copy of it with the deacon, he knowingly left a corrupt copy inſtead of a true one.

3d. When certain grievances were in conſideration among us, he uſing no condeſcenſions, nor making any reflections upon himſelf nor retraction.

4th. When matters were got to the extremity as to ſend out for the firſt council, promiſing before the church that he would not put us to the trouble to prove the articles of charge againſt him, that he would own two thirds or three quarters of the articles of charge, and the next day denying every one of them to the churches committee.

5th. His neglecting and refuſing to read his confeſſion (which he came into at the firſt council) to the congregation.

6th. When much pains had been taken by the people to have things ſettled, and it was promiſed on the part of the aggrieved, that if Mr. *Goſs* would own that he had gone too far in ſelf-juſtification or pleading innocence as to intemperance, and read his confeſſion to the congregation, they would inſiſt upon nothing farther ; yet he inſtead of complying with it, ſet to charging ſome of the aggrieved with blaſphemy, or things bordering upon it.

7th. His challenging a right to diſpenſe with his promiſe.

8th. His diſſolving the church meeting when himſelf ſays there was not one article ſettled.

9th. His refuſing to call one again when requeſted: but inſtead of calling a church meeting, he in *February*, 1771, drew off a party, made a ſchiſm, which he has ever ſince continued to this day.

Thus we have given ſome brief account of the meaſures uſed by Mr. *Goſs* to make diſſatisfaction, ſtrife, &c.

In the 20th page, Mr *Goſs* pretends that he was not diſmiſed by a majority of the church, ſays "26 brethren of the chuſch out of 53, got together, and 24 vote a diſmiſſion of the miniſter,&c. but (he ſays) it is pretty certain that if the whole church had been aſſembled at the time, ſuch vote would not have been obtained."

This we declare to be a very unjuſt repreſentation, for there was but 52 in the church at the time of Mr. *Goſs*'s diſmiſſion, one of whom we appreh ended could not properly act at that time, and hath repeatedly declared that he had no right to act on either part; and we know that every brother of the church being notified to meet at the meeting-houſe in *Bolton*, on the 22d day of *July* 1771—above 30 members did meet at that time and place; that 28 acted in organizing themſelves, viz. chooſing a moderator and ſcribe of the church,and alſo in ſending propoſals to Mr.*Goſs* for his taking a diſmiſſion; and adjourn'd to the 5th day of *Aug.* next following,in order to hear Mr. *Goſs*'s anſwer to ſaid propoſals. That agreable to ſaid adjourment they met, and received an anſwer from Mr. *Goſs* not to accept of our propoſals, nor make any propoſals to us, but concludes, ſaying, "I heartily wiſh you may be directed of God, and that we may all have hearts diſpoſed to comply with it."

Upon the reception of this,the church ſent him another meſſage, ſignifying to him, that as there appeared no proſpect of an accommodation, we therefore adjourned to

Thurſday, one o'clock, P.M. to conſider of the grievances, and if no means of accommodation could be found out, to conſider whether it is beſt on our part to declare the relation diſſolved, and to act accordingly. Signifying withal, that the deſign of the above meſſage was, that he might attend at the time and place if he thought proper. The church, viz. 26 members (two of our number being unable of body to attend) met at the time and place as adjourn'd, and voted Mr. *Goſs*'s diſmiſſion by a unanimous vote, as was declared in open church meeting, and no objection. And that the world may know that Mr. *Goſs*'s pretenſions about the improbability of a vote having been obtained if the whole church had been together, are falſe and groundleſs. We ſign our names hereto, in which ſigning we mean to ſhow that we are ſatisfied of the truth of the facts ſet forth in this Reply. At the ſame time teſtify to the world, that we were for Mr. *Goſs*'s diſmiſſion at the time of it, and have continued ſo ever ſince. We alſo hereby teſtify, that one who then acted for it, has ſince deceaſed, and one who did not then join with us, has ſince united.

And laſt *May* when Mr. *Goſs*'s adherents made their utmoſt efforts againſt our ſettling the Rev. Mr. *Walley*, there could be found no more than 20 brethren to ſign on his ſide, when at the ſame time there was 28 on our's.

| | |
|---|---|
| Samuel Jones, | Benjamin Atherton, |
| Robert Longley, | Josiah Sawyer, |
| Paul Whetcomb, | William Sawyer, |
| Calvin Greenleaf, | Thomas Sawyer, |
| Artemas How, | Oliver Barrett, |
| Israel Greenleaf, | Simon Whetcomb, |
| Eliakim Atherton, | John Whetcomb, |
| David Stiles, | John Hudson, |
| Nathaniel Wilson, | Silas Bailey, |
| John Moore, jun'r. | Ephraim Fairbank, |
| Jabez Fairbank, | John Pierce, |
| David Whetcomb, | Nathaniel Longley, |
| Daniel Greenleaf, | James Goddard. |

*Bolton, Auguſt* 3, 1773.

BRITISH MUSEUM 12N074

# Lately Publiſhed,

And to be Sold at JOHN BOYLE's Printing-Office next Door to the *Three Doves* in Marlborough-Street,

BOSTON:

## The following BOOKS, *Viz.*

A VINDICATION of the Government of the *New-England* Churches: Drawn from Antiquity; the Light of Nature; Holy Scripture; Its Noble Nature; and from the Dignity Divine Providence has put upon it.—ALSO,—The Churches Quarrel Eſpouſed: Or, a Satyrical Reply, to certain Propoſals made, in Anſwer to this Queſtion,—What further Steps are to be taken, that the Councils may have due Conſtitution and Efficacy in Supporting, Preſerving, and Well-Ordering the Intereſt of the Churches in the Country. By JOHN WISE, Late Paſtor to a Church in *Ipſwich*.

A PLATFORM of CHURCH GISCIPLINE: Gathered out of the Word of God, and agreed upon by the Elders and Meſſengers of the Churches aſſembled at *Cambridge*, 1648.

A CONFESSION of FAITH, owned and conſented unto by the Elders and Meſſengers of the Churches aſſembled at *Boſton, New-England, May* 12, 1680.

A TREATISE on CHURCH-GOVERNMENT, in Three Parts: Being, I. A Narrative of the late Troubles and Tranſactions in the Church at *Bolton*, in the *Maſſachuſetts*. II. Some Remarks on Mr. *Adams*'s Sermon, preached there *Auguſt* 26, 1772. With an Appendix, being Remarks on an Account in the Boſton Evening-Poſt, *Dec.* 28, 1772, of the Diſmiſſion of a Miniſter at *Grafton*. III. On Councils, their Buſineſs, Authority and Uſe. With an Eſſay on Miniſters negativing the Votes of the Church, and ſhewing where the Keys of the Church are. By a NEIGHBOUR.

OBSERVATIONS upon the Congregational Plan of Church-Government, particularly as it reſpects the Choice and Removal of Church-Officers, ſupported by the Teſtimony of the Fathers of *New-England*, and unanimouſly offered to the Conſideration of the CHURCHES, by the Convention of the Miniſters of the Province of the *Maſſachuſetts-Bay*, at their annual Meeting in *Boſton, May*, 1773.